Mathematical Programming A manuscript No.
(will be inserted by the editor)

An $\mathcal{O}(n^2 \log(n))$ algorithm for the weighted stable set problem in claw-free graphs

Paolo Nobili · Antonio Sassano

Dedicated to the memory of Manfred Padberg

arXiv:1501.05775v1 [cs.DM] 23 Jan 2015

the date of receipt and acceptance should be inserted later

Abstract A claw-free graph $G(V,E)$ is said to be *basic* if there exists a matching $M \subseteq E$ whose edges are strongly bisimplicial and such that each connected component C of $G - M$ is either a clique or a $\{$*claw, net*$\}$*-free* graph or satisfies $\alpha(G[C \setminus V(M)]) \leq 3$. The *Maximum Weight Stable Set (MWSS) Problem* in a basic claw-free graph can be easily solved by first solving at most four MWSS problems in each connected component of $G - M$ in $\mathcal{O}(|V|^2 \log(|V|))$ time ([7,8]) and then solving the MWSS Problem on a suitable line graph constructed from G in $\mathcal{O}(|V|^2 \log(|V|))$ time. In this paper we show that, by means of *lifting* operations, every claw-free graph $G(V,E)$ can be transformed, in $\mathcal{O}(|V|^2)$ time, into a basic claw-free graph $\bar{G}(\bar{V},\bar{E})$ such that $|\bar{V}| = \mathcal{O}(|V|)$ and a MWSS of G can be obtained from a MWSS of $\bar{G}$. This shows that the complexity of solving the MWSS Problem in a claw-free graph $G(V,E)$ is $\mathcal{O}(|V|^2 \log(|V|))$, the same as in line graphs.

Keywords claw-free graphs · quasi-line graphs · stable set · matching

1 Introduction

The *Maximum Weight Stable Set (MWSS) Problem* in a graph $G(V,E)$ with node-weight function $w : V \rightarrow \Re$ asks for a maximum weight subset of pairwise non-adjacent *nodes*. The Maximum Weight Matching Problem is a special case of the Maximum Weight Stable Set Problem. In fact, the former can be transformed into the latter in a very specific class of graphs: the *line graphs*. The line graph of a graph $G(V,E)$ is the graph $L(G)$ with node set E and edges ef for each pair $\{e,f\}$ of edges of E incident to the same node. A graph G is a *line graph* if and only if there exists a graph H (the *root graph* of G) with the property that $L(H) = G$.

P. Nobili
Dipartimento di Ingegneria dell'Innovazione, Università del Salento, Lecce, Italy

A. Sassano
Dipartimento di Informatica e Sistemistica "Antonio Ruberti", Università di Roma "La Sapienza", Roma, Italy

In [1] Faenza, Oriolo and Stauffer describe a $\mathcal{O}(|V|(|E|+|V|\log(|V|))$ algorithm to solve the MWSS Problem in claw-free graphs. Their algorithm is based on the decomposition of the graph $G(V,E)$ obtained by splitting (*ungluing*) *articulation cliques*, producing a family of *strips*, solving the MWSS Problem on each strip, replacing the strips by simple "gadgets" and, finally, re-assembling the gadgets to produce a line graph H with the property that any MWSS of H "corresponds" to (and can be easily turned into) a MWSS of G. In their algorithm, several steps have a bottleneck time complexity of $\mathcal{O}(|V||E|)$. In particular, in the case of quasi-line graphs, finding the articulation cliques, producing the decomposition and solving the MWSS Problem in the {claw, net}-free strips and in the strips with stability number at most three has a worst-case complexity of $\mathcal{O}(|V||E|)$.

In this paper we solve the MWSS problem on claw-free graphs by using an analogous decomposition. In particular, we introduce new ideas which allow a more efficient implementation of the procedure. First, we construct a special stable set S of $G(V,E)$ which is used to guide the decomposition task; second, we do the splitting on a proper superset of the family of articulation cliques, that we call *weakly normal* cliques, and can be more easily determined; third, we make use of the concept of "lifting" to manage in a simpler way the decomposition process. We show that, with such modifications, the complexity of decomposing $G(V,E)$, constructing the "gadgets" and re-assembling the (line) graph H is dominated by the solution of the weighted matching problem in the root graph of H, thus providing a $\mathcal{O}(|V|^2\log(|V|))$ time algorithm to solve the maximum weight stable set problem in a claw-free graph. This result is, in some sense, the best possible since it aligns the complexity of the maximum weight stable set problem in claw-free and line graphs.

For each graph $G(V,E)$ we denote by $V(F)$ the set of end-nodes of the edges in $F \subseteq E$, by $E(W)$ the set of edges with end-nodes in $W \subseteq V$ and by $N(W)$ (*neighborhood* of W) the set of nodes in $V \setminus W$ adjacent to some node in W. If $W=\{w\}$ we simply write $N(w)$. We denote by $N[W]$ and $N[w]$ the sets $N(W)\cup W$ and $N(w)\cup\{w\}$ and by $\delta(W)$ the set of edges having exactly one end-node in W; if $\delta(W)=\emptyset$ and W is minimal with this property we say that W is (or induces) a connected component of G. We denote by $G-F$ the subgraph of G obtained by removing from G the edges in $F \subseteq E$. A *clique* is a complete subgraph of G induced by some set of nodes $K \subseteq V$. With a little abuse of notation we also regard the set K as a clique and, for any edge $uv \in E$, both uv and $\{u,v\}$ are said to be a clique. A node w such that $N(w)$ is a clique is said to be *simplicial.* By extension, a clique K such that $N(K)$ is a clique is also said to be *simplicial.* A *claw* is a graph with four nodes w,x,y,z with w adjacent to x,y,z and x,y,z mutually non-adjacent. To highlight its structure, it is denoted as $(w:x,y,z)$. A P_k is a (chordless) path induced by k nodes $u_1,u_2,\ldots,u_k$ and will be denoted as $(u_1,\ldots,u_k)$. A subset $T \in V$ is *null* (*universal*) to a subset $W \subseteq V \setminus T$ if and only if $N(T)\cap W=\emptyset$ ($N(T)\cap W=W$). Two nodes $u,v \in V$ are said to be *twins* if $N(u)\setminus\{v\}=N(v)\setminus\{u\}$. We can always remove a twin from V without affecting the value of the optimal MWSS. In fact, if $uv \in E$ we can remove the twin with minimum weight, while if $uv \notin E$ we can remove u and replace $w(v)$ by $w(u)+w(v)$. The complexity of removing all the twins is $\mathcal{O}(|V|^2)$ ([3]) and hence we assume throughout the paper that our graphs have no twins. A *paw*

$(x, y : z, h)$ is a graph induced by two edges xy and zh with z universal and h null to $\{x, y\}$. A *net* $(x, y, z : x', y', z')$ is a graph induced by a triangle $T = \{x, y, z\}$ and three stable nodes $\{x', y', z'\}$ with $N(x') \cap T = \{x\}$, $N(y') \cap T = \{y\}$ and $N(z') \cap T = \{z\}$.

We say that a node $v \in V$ is *regular* if its neighborhood can be partitioned into two cliques. A graph $G(V, E)$ is *quasi-line* if all of its nodes are regular. Each line graph is a quasi-line graph and each quasi-line graph is a claw-free graph. A 5-*wheel* $W_5 = (\overline{v} : v_1, \ldots, v_5)$ is a graph consisting of a 5-hole $R = \{v_1, \ldots, v_5\}$ called *rim* of W_5 and the node $\overline{v}$ (*hub* of W_5) adjacent to every node of R.

2 Wings and similarity classes

Let S be a stable set of $G(V, E)$. Any node $s \in S$ is said to be *stable*; any node $v \in V \setminus S$ satisfies $|N(v) \cap S| \leq 2$ and is called *superfree* if $|N(v) \cap S| = 0$, *free* if $|N(v) \cap S| = 1$ and *bound* if $|N(v) \cap S| = 2$. For each free node u we denote by $S(u)$ the unique node in S adjacent to u. Observe that, by claw-freeness, a bound node b cannot be adjacent to a node $u \in V \setminus S$ unless b and u have a common neighbor in S.

We denote by $F_S(t)$ the set of free nodes with respect to S which are adjacent to some node $t \in S$. A node $z \in F_S(t)$ is said to be an *outer node* for t if there exists a free node x adjacent to z and to a node $q \in S \setminus \{t\}$; the set of outer nodes for t is denoted by $O_S(t)$. Every node of $F_S(t)$ which is not an outer node is said to be an *inner node* for t; the set of inner nodes for t is denoted by $I_S(t)$. To simplify our notation we will omit the reference to S when it is clear from the context.

A *bound-wing* defined by $\{s, t\} \subseteq S$ is the set $W^B(s, t) = \{u \in V \setminus S : N(u) \cap S = \{s, t\}\}$. A *free-wing* defined by the ordered pair (s, t) $(s, t \in S)$ is the set $W^F(s, t) = \{u \in F(s) : N(u) \cap F(t) \neq \emptyset\}$. Observe that, by claw-freeness, any bound node is contained in a single bound-wing. On the other hand, a free node can belong to several free-wings. Moreover, while $W^B(s, t) \equiv W^B(t, s)$, we have $W^F(s, t) \neq W^F(t, s)$. By slightly generalizing the definition due to Minty [6], we call *wing* defined by (s, t) $(s, t \in S)$ the set $W(s, t) = W^B(s, t) \cup W^F(s, t) \cup W^F(t, s)$. Observe that $W(s, t) = W(t, s)$. The nodes s and t are said to be the *extrema* of the wing $W(s, t)$.

A node $s \in S$ is said to be *k-winged* if s defines wings with k distinct nodes $s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_k \in S$. The number of wings defined by s is also said to be the *wing number* of s and denoted by k_s. For each regular node $s \in S$, the set $N[s]$ can be covered by two maximal cliques, say C_s and $\overline{C}_s$. For each wing $W(s, t)$ defined by a regular node $s \in S$, let $C_s(t) = C_s \cap W(s, t)$ and $\overline{C}_s(t) = \overline{C}_s \cap W(s, t)$. We call $C_s(t)$ and $\overline{C}_s(t)$ the *partial wings* defined by t in C_s and $\overline{C}_s$. For each node $s \in S$ we regard the sets $C_s(s) = \{s\} \cup (I(s) \cap C_s)$ and $\overline{C}_s(s) = \{s\} \cup (I(s) \cap \overline{C}_s)$ as degenerate partial wings. Observe that both C_s and $\overline{C}_s$ are partitioned into partial wings. Moreover, each bound node u is contained in at most four, possibly coincident, partial wings (namely $C_s(t), C_t(s), \overline{C}_s(t), \overline{C}_t(s)$ where s and t are stable nodes adjacent to u) and each free node u is contained in at most two partial wings (possibly coincident and/or degenerate). This implies that the total number of partial wings is $\mathcal{O}(|V|)$.

Following Schrijver [9] we say that two nodes u and v in $V \setminus S$ are *similar* $(u \sim v)$ if $N(u) \cap S = N(v) \cap S$ and *dissimilar*$(u \not\sim v)$ otherwise. Clearly, similarity induces an equivalence relation on $V \setminus S$ and a partition in *similarity classes*. Similarity classes can be *bound*, *free* or *superfree* in that they are entirely composed by nodes that are bound, free or superfree with respect to S. Bound similarity classes are precisely the bound-wings defined by pairs of nodes of S, while each free similarity class contains the (free) nodes adjacent to the same node of S. Let V_F be the set of nodes that are free with respect to S and let $G_F(V_F, E_F)$ be the graph with edge-set $E_F = \{uv \in E : u, v \in V_F, u \not\sim v\}$ (*free dissimilarity graph*).

Definition 21 *Let $G(V,E)$ be a claw-free graph, S a maximal stable set in G and G_F the free dissimilarity graph of G with respect to S. A connected component of G_F inducing a maximal clique in G is said to be a* free component *of G with respect to S. The family of the free components of G with respect to S is denoted by $\mathcal{F}(S)$.* $\square$

Observe that the fact that a free component is a maximal clique implies that it intersects at least two free similarity classes and hence contains at least two nodes. The next theorem has been proved in [8].

Theorem 21 *[8] Let $G(V,E)$ be a claw-free graph and S a maximal stable set of G. Then a connected component of G_F intersecting three or more free similarity classes induces a maximal clique in G and hence is a free component.* $\square$

Theorem 22 *Let $G(V,E)$ be a claw-free graph and S a maximal stable set of G. A node $u \in V \setminus S$ belongs to at most one wing if and only if it does not belong to any free component intersecting three or more similarity classes.*

Proof. Let u be a node in $V \setminus S$ and assume first that it belongs to some free component C intersecting three or more similarity classes. Let $s = S(u)$ and let $s', s'' \neq s$ be two nodes in S adjacent to C. Then u belongs to the wings $W(s,s')$ and $W(s,s'')$. Assume now that u does not belong to any free component intersecting three or more similarity classes. If u is a bound node, then it obviously belongs to a unique wing. On the other hand, if u is a free node belonging to two different wings, then there exist two free nodes, say x and y, adjacent to u and with $S(u) \neq S(x) \neq S(y) \neq S(u)$. It follows that u, x and y belong to three different similarity classes, a contradiction. $\square$

3 Normal and weakly normal cliques

Definition 31 *[8] A maximal clique Q in a graph $G(V,E)$ is said to be* bisimplicial *if $N(Q)$ is partitioned into two cliques K_1, K_2. The clique Q is said to be* strongly bisimplicial *if K_1 is null to K_2.* $\square$

A maximal clique Q is *reducible* if $\alpha(N(Q)) \leq 2$. If Q is a maximal clique, two non-adjacent nodes $u, v \in N(Q)$ are said to be *Q-distant* if $N(u) \cap N(v) \cap Q = \emptyset$ and *Q-close* otherwise $(N(u) \cap N(v) \cap Q \neq \emptyset)$. A maximal clique Q is *normal* if it has three independent neighbors that are mutually Q-distant. In [4] Lovász and Plummer proved the following useful properties of a maximal clique in a claw-free graph.

Proposition 31 *[4] Let $G(V, E)$ be a claw-free graph. If Q is a maximal clique in G then:*

(i) *if u and v are Q-close then $Q \subseteq N(u) \cup N(v)$;*
(ii) *if u, v, w are mutually non-adjacent nodes in $N(Q)$ and two of them are Q-distant then any two of them are Q-distant;*
(iii) *if u, v, w are mutually non-adjacent nodes in $N(Q)$ and $z \in N(Q)$ is not adjacent to u then u and z are Q-distant;*
(iv) *if Q is normal and u and v are Q-close then each node $x \in N(u) \cap N(v) \cap Q$ is the hub of a 5-wheel.*

□

The next theorem states a new property of normal cliques.

Theorem 31 *Let $G(V, E)$ be a claw-free graph and u a regular node in V whose closed neighborhood is covered by two non-empty maximal cliques Q and $\overline{Q}$. Then Q is normal if and only if there exist two Q-distant nodes $x, y \in N(Q) \setminus N(u)$ and a node $z \in \overline{Q} \setminus Q$ null to $\{x, y\}$.*

Proof. If $x, y \in N(Q) \setminus N(u)$ are Q-distant and there exist a node $z \in \overline{Q} \setminus Q$ null to $\{x, y\}$ then, by *(ii)* of Proposition 31, we have that x, y, z are mutually Q-distant and hence that Q is normal. Suppose now that Q is normal and let x, y, z be three Q-distant nodes in $N(Q)$. Assume, without loss of generality, that $x, y \notin N(u)$. If z belongs to $\overline{Q}$ the theorem follows. So, assume that $z \notin \overline{Q}$ and hence that $z \notin N(u)$. If $N(x) \cup N(y) \not\supseteq \overline{Q} \setminus Q$ the theorem follows. So, assume that $N(x) \cup N(y) \supseteq \overline{Q} \setminus Q$ and hence, without loss of generality, that there exists a node $t \in \overline{Q} \setminus Q$ which is adjacent to x and not adjacent to y (otherwise $(t : x, y, u)$ would be a claw). Observe that the node t is also non-adjacent to z (otherwise $(t : x, z, u)$ would be a claw). But then the nodes y and z are Q-distant and have the property that $N(x) \cup N(z) \not\supseteq \overline{Q} \setminus Q$ and again the theorem follows. □

Property *(iv)* of Proposition 31 implies that in a claw-free graph a normal clique either contains the hub of a 5-wheel or has the property that every two non-adjacent nodes in $N(Q)$ are Q-distant. This suggests the following definition.

Definition 32 *A maximal clique Q in a graph $G(V, E)$ is said to be* weakly normal *if every two non-adjacent nodes in $N(Q)$ are Q-distant.* □

Evidently, a weakly normal clique Q is normal if and only if $\alpha(N(Q)) \geq 3$. Moreover, each node u in a weakly normal clique Q is regular since Q and $N(u) \setminus Q$ are two cliques covering $N[u]$.

Theorem 32 *Let $G(V, E)$ be a claw-free graph and u a regular node in V whose closed neighborhood is covered by two maximal cliques Q and $\overline{Q}$. If Q $(\overline{Q})$ is not reducible then it is normal.*

Proof. Suppose, by contradiction, that Q is not normal and $\alpha(N(Q)) \geq 3$. Let v_1, v_2, v_3 be three mutually non-adjacent nodes in $N(Q)$. If u is not adjacent to v_1, v_2, v_3, then by *(i)* of Proposition 31 we have that v_1, v_2, v_3 are mutually distant with respect to Q and hence Q is normal, a contradiction. Consequently, without loss of generality, we can assume that u is adjacent to v_1 and so v_1 belongs to $\overline{Q}$.

The nodes v_2 and v_3 do not belong to $Q \cup \overline{Q}$ and hence are not adjacent to u. It follows, again by *(i)* of Proposition 31, that v_2 and v_3 are distant with respect to Q. But then, by *(ii)* of Proposition 31, the three nodes v_1, v_2, v_3 are mutually distant (with respect to Q) and again Q is a normal clique, a contradiction. $\square$

Since, by *(iv)* of Proposition 31, a normal clique in a quasi-line graph is weakly normal we have also the following.

Corollary 31 *In a quasi-line graph $G(V, E)$, a clique Q is normal if and only if it is non-reducible and weakly normal.* $\square$

Lemma 31 *Let $G(V, E)$ be a quasi-line graph and Q a strongly bisimplicial clique with $N(Q)$ covered by the non-empty and disjoint cliques K_1 and K_2, null to each other. If $\tilde{K}_1 = K_1 \cup (N(K_1) \cap Q)$ ($\tilde{K}_2 = K_2 \cup (N(K_2) \cap Q)$) is a clique then it is also weakly normal.*

Proof. By symmetry it is sufficient to prove the result for $\tilde{K}_1$, assuming it is a clique. First observe that $\tilde{K}_1$ is a maximal clique. Now suppose, by contradiction, that there exist two non-adjacent nodes x, y in $N(\tilde{K}_1)$ adjacent to some node $z \in \tilde{K}_1$. The node z belongs to K_1, since otherwise both x and y would belong to $N(Q) \setminus K_1 = K_2$, a contradiction. Let u be any node in $Q \cap N(K_1)$. It follows that $x, y \notin N(u)$ and hence $(z : x, y, u)$ is a claw in G, a contradiction. $\square$

Observe that the notion of *articulation clique*, defined by Faenza et al. ([1]), is strictly related to the notions of normal clique (called *net clique* in [1]) and weakly normal clique. In particular, in a quasi-line graph the class of normal cliques is properly contained in the class of articulation cliques which, in turn, is properly contained in the class of weakly normal cliques. Also the lifting operation described in the next section is related to the "ungluing" operation of articulation cliques introduced by Faenza et al. in [1] where is proved that the list of articulation cliques of a quasi-line graph $G(V, E)$ and the ungluing of each one of them can be performed in $\mathcal{O}(|V||E|)$ time. In what follows, we will show how to construct, in $\mathcal{O}(|V|^2)$ time, a list of weakly normal cliques containing all the normal cliques (but not necessarily all the articulation cliques) and lift, again in $\mathcal{O}(|V|^2)$ time, each one of them.

4 Lifting operation

Definition 41 *Let $G(V, E)$ be a connected graph, Q a maximal clique in G and $\mathcal{K} = \{K_1, K_2, \ldots, K_p\}$ a partition of Q. The graph $G^{(Q,\mathcal{K})}$ obtained by removing all the edges connecting different sets in $\mathcal{K}$, adding a clique $\{\overline{q}_1, \ldots, \overline{q}_p\}$, a stable set $\{q_1, \ldots, q_p\}$ and new edges $q_i\overline{q}_i$ and $q_i t$ for each $t \in K_i$ ($i = 1, \ldots, p$) is said to be the* lifting *of Q in G with respect to $\mathcal{K}$. The family $\mathcal{K}$ is said to be a* lifting partition, *the clique $\{\overline{q}_1, \ldots, \overline{q}_p\}$ is said to be the* lifting clique *and the edges $q_i\overline{q}_i$ ($i = 1, \ldots, p$) are said to be* lifting edges. $\square$

Observe that the lifting edges $q_i\overline{q}_i$ ($i = 1, \ldots p$) define a matching in $G^{(Q,\mathcal{K})}$ and are strongly bisimplicial cliques.

The next theorem shows that the lifting operation does not turn a clique which is not weakly normal into a weakly normal one.

Theorem 41 *Let $G(V,E)$ be a graph, Q a clique in G and $\mathcal{K}$ a partition of Q. Then any maximal clique belonging both to G and to $G^{(Q,\mathcal{K})}$ which is weakly normal in $G^{(Q,\mathcal{K})}$ is also weakly normal in G.*

Proof. By contradiction, assume that there exists a maximal clique Q' belonging both to G and to $G^{(Q,\mathcal{K})}$ which is weakly normal in $G^{(Q,\mathcal{K})}$ but is not weakly normal in G. It follows that in G there exist non-adjacent nodes $x,y \in N(Q')$ having a common neighbor $z \in Q'$ but such a configuration is not preserved in $G^{(Q,\mathcal{K})}$. Since the lifting operation does not remove nodes nor adds edges connecting previously existing nodes, we have that one of the two edges xz and yz has been removed; without loss of generality, assume that x and z are not adjacent in $G^{(Q,\mathcal{K})}$. It follows that the nodes x and z belong to different sets in $\mathcal{K}$, say $x \in K_j$ and $z \in K_h$. But then in $G^{(Q,\mathcal{K})}$ q_h (the lifting node adjacent to K_h in $G^{(Q,\mathcal{K})}$) and y are non-adjacent nodes in $N(Q')$ having the common neighbor $z \in Q'$, contradicting the assumption that Q' is weakly normal in $G^{(Q,\mathcal{K})}$. The theorem follows. □

The lifting operation has the property that applying the *edge projection* [5] to the lifting edges $q_i\overline{q}_i$ produces the original graph G. The maximum weight stable set of $G^{(Q,\mathcal{K})}$ is strongly related to the maximum weight stable set of G (for suitably chosen weight vectors).

Definition 42 *Let $G(V,E)$ be a graph with node weighting $w \in \Re^V$. Let $\mathcal{K}$ ($|\mathcal{K}| = p \geq 2$) be a partition of a maximal clique Q in G and $G^{(Q,\mathcal{K})}(\hat{V},\hat{E})$ the lifting of Q in G with respect to $\mathcal{K}$ and let $q_i\overline{q}_i$ ($i = 1,\dots,p$) be the lifting edges. Let $w_M > \max_{v\in V}\{w(v)\}$. The vector $w^{(Q,\mathcal{K})}$ with $w^{(Q,\mathcal{K})}(v) = w(v)$ for each node $v \in V$ and $w^{(Q,\mathcal{K})}(q_i) = w^{(Q,\mathcal{K})}(\overline{q}_i) = w_M$ ($i = 1,\dots,p$) is said to be the* extension *of w in $G^{(Q,\mathcal{K})}$.* □

Theorem 42 *Let $G(V,E)$ be a graph with node weighting $w \in \Re^V$. Let $\mathcal{K} = \{K_1,\dots,K_p\}$ ($p \geq 2$) be a partition of a maximal clique Q in G and $G^{(Q,\mathcal{K})}(\hat{V},\hat{E})$ the lifting of Q in G with respect to $\mathcal{K}$ and let $q_i\overline{q}_i$ ($i = 1,\dots,p$) be the lifting edges. Let S^* be a maximum weight stable set in $G^{(Q,\mathcal{K})}$ with respect to the extension $w^{(Q,\mathcal{K})}$ of w. Then $S^*\cap\{q_i,\overline{q}_i\} \neq \emptyset$ ($i = 1,\dots,p$) and $\bar{S} = S^*\setminus\{q_i,\overline{q}_i : i = 1,\dots,p\}$ is a maximum weight stable set in G with respect to w).*

Proof. We have $S^* \cap \{q_i,\overline{q}_i\} \neq \emptyset$, otherwise $S = (S^* \setminus K_i) \cup \{q_i\}$ would be a stable set in $G^{(Q,\mathcal{K})}$ with $\hat{w}(S) > \hat{w}(S^*)$, contradicting the optimality of S^*. Suppose now that $\bar{S} = S^* \setminus \{q_i,\overline{q}_i : i = 1,\dots,p\}$ is not a stable set with maximum weight in G (w.r.t. w) and let $\tilde{S}$ be a stable set in G with $w(\tilde{S}) > w(\bar{S})$. We have $|\tilde{S} \cap Q| \leq 1$ and hence $\tilde{S}\cap K_i \neq \emptyset$ for at most one index $i \in \{1,\dots,p\}$. Assume, without loss of generality, $\tilde{S} \cap K_i = \emptyset$ for $i = 1,\dots,p-1$. But then $S = \tilde{S} \cup \{q_1,q_2,\dots,q_{p-1},\overline{q}_p\}$ is a stable set in $G^{(Q,\mathcal{K})}$ with $w(S) > w(S^*)$, contradicting its optimality. The theorem follows. □

In general the lifting operation does not preserve specific structural properties. A line graph can be lifted into a non-line graph and the lifting of a claw-free graph could well contain one or more claws. We are interested in cases in which the lifting operation preserves some structural property. In particular we would like to characterize the cliques whose lifting turns claw-free graphs into claw-free graphs. To this purpose, we first need few more definitions.

Definition 43 *Let Q be a maximal clique in G. A Q-*paw *of G is a paw $(x, y : z, h)$ with $x, y \in Q$ and $z, h \notin Q$. The pair x, y is said to be the* base *of the Q-paw.* $\square$

Definition 44 *A maximal clique Q is* liftable *in G if there exists a non-trivial partition (*lifting partition*) $\mathcal{K} = \{K_1, K_2, \dots, K_p\}$ $(p \geq 2)$ of Q with the following properties:*

(i) *Q is weakly normal;*
(ii) *no pair of nodes $x \in K_i$, $y \in K_j$ $(i \neq j,\ K_i, K_j \in \mathcal{K})$ is the base of a Q-paw;*
(iii) *no triple of nodes $x \in K_i$, $y \in K_j$, $z \in K_t$ $(i \neq j \neq t \neq i,\ K_i, K_j, K_t \in \mathcal{K})$ have a common neighbor in $N(Q)$.* $\square$

We are now ready to state the sought for characterization of maximal cliques whose lifting preserves claw-freeness.

Theorem 43 *Let $G(V, E)$ be a claw-free graph, Q a maximal clique in G and $\mathcal{K} = \{K_1, K_2, \dots, K_p\}$ a lifting partition of Q. The lifting $G^{(Q,\mathcal{K})}(\hat{V}, \hat{E})$ with lifting edges $q_i\overline{q}_i$ $(i = 1, \dots, p)$ is a claw-free graph if and only if Q is liftable with respect to $\mathcal{K}$.*

Proof. The "only if" part of the proof is trivial: in fact, if two non-adjacent nodes $x, y \notin Q$ have a common neighbor $h \in Q$ then $(h : x, y, q_i)$ (where K_i is the subset of Q containing h) is a claw in $G^{(Q,\mathcal{K})}$; on the other hand, if there exists a node $h\ \not inQ$ adjacent to a node $x \in K_i$, a node $y \in K_j$ $(K_i \neq K_j \in \mathcal{K})$ and a node $z \notin Q$ such that $xz \notin E$ and $yz \notin E$, we have that $(h : x, y, z)$ is a claw in $G^{(Q,\mathcal{K})}$. Finally, if there exists a triple of nodes $x \in K_i$, $y \in K_j$, $z \in K_t$ $(i \neq j \neq t \neq i$, $K_i, K_j, K_t \in \mathcal{K})$ having a common neighbor $h \in N(Q)$, we have that $(h : x, y, z)$ is a claw in $G^{(Q,\mathcal{K})}$.

To prove the "if" part of the theorem, assume by contradiction that $G^{(Q,\mathcal{K})}$ contains a claw $(h : x, y, z)$ and let $\overline{Q}$ be the lifting clique $\{\overline{q}_1, \dots, \overline{q}_p\}$. Since both $N(q_i)$ and $N(\overline{q}_i)$ $(i = 1, \dots, p)$ are partitioned in two cliques, we have $h \notin \{q_i, \overline{q}_i : i = 1, \dots, p\}$. Consequently, x, y, z do not belong to $\overline{Q}$. So, two cases are possible: either *(a)* there exists and index $i \in \{1, \dots, p\}$ such that $q_i \in \{x, y, z\}$ or *(b)* $q_i \notin \{h, x, y, z\}$ for every $i \in \{1, \dots, p\}$.

(a) In this case, we can assume, without loss of generality, $q_i \equiv x$. Since h is not $\overline{q}_i$, we have $h \in K_i$. Moreover, since xy and xz do not belong to $\hat{E}$, we have $y, z \notin K_i$ and, since hy and hz belong to $\hat{E}$, we also have $y, z \notin Q \setminus K_i$. Finally, we have $yz \notin E$, since the only edges removed by the lifting operation are those with both ends in Q. But then y and z are two non-adjacent nodes in $V \setminus Q$ having a common neighbor (h) in Q, contradicting property *(i)* of Definition 44.

(b) In this case, all the edges of the claw are also edges in E. Hence, since G is claw-free, two of the nodes in $\{x, y, z\}$ are adjacent in G. Without loss of generality, assume $xy \in E$, $x \in K_i$ and $y \in K_j$ $(i \neq j)$. We have $h \notin Q$, since both hx and hy belong to $\hat{E}$. If also z does not belong to Q, then $xz, yz \notin E$ (since only edges with both ends in Q are removed by the lifting operation) and hence h violates property *(ii)* of Definition 44. If, conversely, $z \in Q$, since $xz, yz \notin \hat{E}$, we have $z \in K_t$ with $t \neq i, j$. But then h violates property *(iii)* of Definition 44. The theorem follows. $\square$

The following two theorems show that by lifting liftable cliques we also preserve the property of being {claw, 5-wheel}-free and quasi-line.

Theorem 44 *Let $G(V,E)$ be a claw-free graph and Q a liftable clique in G with respect to $\mathcal{K}=\{K_1,K_2,\dots,K_p\}$. If G is 5-wheel-free then the lifting $G^{(Q,\mathcal{K})}(\hat{V},\hat{E})$ is 5-wheel-free.*

Proof. The graph $G^{(Q,\mathcal{K})}$ is claw-free by Theorem 43. Suppose, by contradiction, that there exists a 5-wheel $W=(v_0:v_1,\dots,v_5)$ in $G^{(Q,\mathcal{K})}$. We first observe that, for each $i\in\{1,\dots,p\}$, the lifting nodes q_i and $\overline{q}_i$ have the property that $K_i=N(q_i)\setminus\{\overline{q}_i\}$ is null to $\overline{Q}=N(\overline{q}_i)\setminus\{q_i\}$ in $G^{(Q,\mathcal{K})}$. It is now easy to check that if both q_i and $\overline{q}_i$ belong to W then they have a common neighbor (a contradiction) while if only one of them belongs to W then either K_i or $\overline{Q}$ is not a clique (again a contradiction). It follows that $W\cap\{q_i,\overline{q}_i\}=\emptyset$ for each $i\in\{1,\dots,p\}$ and that any edge in $\hat{E}$ with both end-nodes in W also belongs to E. Since W does not induce a 5-wheel in G, there exists an edge, say v_1v_3 in $E\setminus\hat{E}$. Without loss of generality, we can assume $v_1\in K_i$ and $v_3\in K_j$ $(i\neq j)$ and hence $q_iv_1\in\hat{E}$ and $q_jv_3\in\hat{E}$. Observe now that v_2 belongs neither to K_i (being adjacent to $v_3\in K_j$) nor to K_j (being adjacent to $v_1\in K_i$). It follows that v_2 is non-adjacent to both q_i and q_j in $G^{(Q,\mathcal{K})}$. But then, by claw-freeness of $G^{(Q,\mathcal{K})}$, the nodes q_i and q_j are adjacent, respectively, to v_5 and v_4. This implies $v_5\in K_i$ and $v_4\in K_j$, contradicting the fact that the edge v_4v_5 belongs to $\hat{E}$. □

Theorem 45 *Let $G(V,E)$ be a quasi-line graph and Q a liftable clique in G with respect to $\mathcal{K}=\{K_1,K_2,\dots,K_p\}$. Then the lifting $G^{(Q,\mathcal{K})}(\hat{V},\hat{E})$ is quasi-line.*

Proof. The result is trivial if $\alpha(G)=1$. In the other cases we have $\alpha(G^{(Q,\mathcal{K})})>\alpha(G)\geq 2$ and the theorem follows from Theorem 43, Theorem 44 and the aforementioned result by Fouquet [2]. □

In [8] we introduced the notion of *canonical* stable set of G and showed how to produce it in time $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{|E|}|V|)$.

Definition 45 *[8] Let $G(V,E)$ be a connected claw-free graph. A maximal stable set S of G is said to be* canonical *if and only if G does not contain:*

(i) *an augmenting P_3 with respect to S;*
(ii) *a free node x with $N(x)\supset N(S(x))\setminus\{x\}$ (*dominating free node*).* □

Theorem 46 *[8] Let $G(V,E)$ be a claw-free graph and S_0 a maximal stable set of G. Then a canonical stable set can be obtained from S_0 in time $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{|E|}|V|)$.* □

Definition 46 *Let $G(V,E)$ be a graph and let $M\subseteq E$ be a matching of G. A clique Q of G is said to be* matched by M *or an M-*clique *if and only if $\emptyset\neq\delta(Q)\subseteq M$.* □

Definition 47 *Let $G(V,E)$ be a claw-free graph. A matching M is said to be* canonical *if* (i) *each edge $uv\in M$ is a strongly bisimplicial clique and* (ii) *either $N[u]$ or $N[v]$ is an M-clique. A canonical matching M is said to be an S-*matching *if for each edge $uv\in M$ we have $|\{u,v\}\cap S|=1$ (uv is* saturated *by S).* □

Definition 48 *Let $G(V,E)$ be a claw-free graph, S a canonical stable set of G, $M\subseteq E$ an S-matching and Q a liftable clique of G with respect to a lifting partition $\mathcal{K}=\{K_1,K_2,\dots,K_p\}$. Let $G^{(Q,\mathcal{K})}$ be the lifting of Q with respect to $\mathcal{K}$ and let $q_i\overline{q}_i$ ($i=1,\dots p$) be the lifting edges. We let:*

- $S^{(Q,\mathcal{K})} := S \cup \{q_i : K_i \cap S = \emptyset\} \cup \{\overline{q}_i : K_i \cap S \neq \emptyset\}$;
- $M^{(Q,\mathcal{K})} := M \cup \{q_i\overline{q}_i : i = 1, \dots p\}$.

The sets $S^{(Q,\mathcal{K})}$ *and* $M^{(Q,\mathcal{K})}$ *are said to be the* extensions *of* S *and* M*, respectively, in* $G^{(Q,\mathcal{K})}$. □

By construction, the extension $M^{(Q,\mathcal{K})}$ of M is an $S^{(Q,\mathcal{K})}$-matching in $G^{(Q,K)}$. The following theorem shows that $S^{(Q,\mathcal{K})}$ is a canonical stable set in $G^{(Q,\mathcal{K})}$.

Theorem 47 *Let* $G(V, E)$ *be a claw-free graph and* S *a canonical stable set of* G*. Let* Q *be a liftable clique of* G *with respect to a lifting partition* $\mathcal{K}$*. Then the extension* $S^{(Q,\mathcal{K})}$ *of* S *is a canonical stable set of the graph* $G^{(Q,\mathcal{K})}$ *obtained from* G *by lifting the clique* Q *with respect to* $\mathcal{K}$*.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{K} = \{K_1, K_2, \dots, K_p\}$ and let $q_i\overline{q}_i$ $(i = 1, \dots p)$ be the lifting edges. Let $\overline{Q} = \{\overline{q}_1, \dots, \overline{q}_p\}$ and observe that either Q contains a node $s \in S$ or every node in Q is free. In fact, if Q contains a bound node x with $N(x) \cap S = \{s, t\}$ then the hypothesis that Q is liftable (and hence weakly normal) implies that either s or t belongs to Q. Consider first the case $Q \cap S = \emptyset$ and observe that any node in K_i $(i \in \{1, \dots, p\})$ belongs to the set of free nodes in G with respect to S and becomes bound in $G^{(Q,\mathcal{K})}$ with respect to $S^{(Q,\mathcal{K})}$. Moreover, the nodes in $\overline{Q}$ are free with respect to $S^{(Q,\mathcal{K})}$. Suppose that (u, s, v) is an augmenting P_3 in $G^{(Q,\mathcal{K})}$ with respect to $S^{(Q,\mathcal{K})}$. We have $s \neq q_i$ $(i \in \{1, \dots, p\})$, since $\overline{q}_i$ is the unique free node with respect to $S^{(Q,\mathcal{K})}$ which is adjacent to q_i in $G^{(Q,\mathcal{K})}$. It follows that the nodes u, s, v belong to G, s is a stable node in S and u, v are free nodes in G with respect to S. Since S is canonical in G we have $uv \in E$ and hence the edge uv has been removed by the lifting operation. But this is impossible since the end-nodes of each edge removed by the lifting operation belong to different sets of $\mathcal{K}$ and are bound in $G^{(Q,\mathcal{K})}$ with respect to $S^{(Q,\mathcal{K})}$. It follows that there exists no augmenting P_3 in $G^{(Q,\mathcal{K})}$ with respect to $S^{(Q,\mathcal{K})}$. Suppose now that x is a dominating free node in $G^{(Q,\mathcal{K})}$ adjacent to a node $s \in S^{(Q,\mathcal{K})}$. We have $x \notin \overline{Q}$ and $s \neq q_i$ $(i \in \{1, \dots, p\})$, so both x and s belong to G, s is a stable node in S and x is a free node in G with respect to S. Since x is not dominating in G with respect to S, we have that there exists a node $\overline{x}$ which is adjacent to s and not adjacent to x in G. The node $\overline{x}$ is not adjacent to s in $G^{(Q,\mathcal{K})}$, so the edge $s\overline{x}$ has been removed by the lifting operation. But this is impossible since both end-nodes of each edge removed by the lifting operation are free in G with respect to S.

To complete the proof, consider now the case in which $Q \cap S \neq \emptyset$ and assume that t is the unique node in $Q \cap S$. Without loss of generality, we can assume $t \in K_1$. Observe that any node that is free, bound or stable in G with respect to S is also free, bound or, respectively, stable in $G^{(Q,\mathcal{K})}$ with respect to $S^{(Q,\mathcal{K})}$. Moreover the nodes $\{\overline{q}_1, q_2, \dots, q_p\}$ belong to $S^{(Q,\mathcal{K})}$ while the nodes $\{q_1, \overline{q}_2, \dots, \overline{q}_p\}$ are bound in $G^{(Q,\mathcal{K})}$ with respect to $S^{(Q,\mathcal{K})}$. Suppose that (u, s, v) is an augmenting P_3 in $G^{(Q,\mathcal{K})}$ with respect to $S^{(Q,\mathcal{K})}$. We have $s \notin \{q_i, \overline{q}_i\}$ $(i \in \{1, \dots, p\})$. It follows that the nodes u, s, v belong to G, s is a stable node in S and u, v are free nodes in G with respect to S. Since S is canonical in G we have $uv \in E$ and hence the edge uv has been removed by the lifting operation. It follows that the nodes u, v belong to different sets of $\mathcal{K}$. Moreover, s coincides with t, since this is the only node in S adjacent to the free nodes in Q. But this is impossible since one of the edges ut, vt would also have been removed by the lifting operation. It follows that there exists no augmenting P_3 in $G^{(Q,\mathcal{K})}$ with respect to $S^{(Q,\mathcal{K})}$. Suppose now that x is a dominating free node in $G^{(Q,\mathcal{K})}$ adjacent to a node $s \in S^{(Q,\mathcal{K})}$. We have $x, s \notin \{q_i, \overline{q}_i\}$ $(i \in \{1, \dots, p\})$ so both x and s belong to G, s is a stable node in S and x is a free node in G with respect to S. Since x is not dominating in G with respect to S, we have that there exists a node $\overline{x}$ which is adjacent to s and not adjacent to x in G. The node $\overline{x}$ is not adjacent to s in $G^{(Q,\mathcal{K})}$, so the edge $s\overline{x}$ has been removed by the lifting operation. Hence, we have $s, \overline{x} \in Q$ and $x \notin Q$. Moreover, s coincides with t since this is the only node in $S \cap Q$. The nodes $s, \overline{x}$ belong to different sets of $\mathcal{K}$. Assume, without loss of generality, $s \in K_i$ and $\overline{x} \in K_j$. But then q_i is adjacent to s and non-adjacent to x in $G^{(Q,\mathcal{K})}$, contradicting the fact that x is dominating. The theorem follows. □

Let $G(V, E)$ be a claw-free graph with node weighting w, S a canonical stable set of G and $M \subseteq E$ an S-matching. Let $\overline{G}$, $\overline{S}$, $\overline{M}$ and $\overline{w}$ be the graph, stable set, $\overline{S}$-matching and weight vector obtained after a sequence of liftings and corresponding extensions from G, S, M and w, respectively. In the following, with a little abuse of notation, we will say that $\overline{S}$, $\overline{M}$ and $\overline{w}$ are the *extensions of* S*,* M *and* w in $\overline{G}$.

5 *S*-cover and free components

Definition 51 *Let* $G(V, E)$ *be a claw-free graph and* S *a canonical stable set of* G*. For each* regular *node* $s \in S$ *let* C_s *and* $\overline{C}_s$ *be maximal cliques covering* $N[s]$*. The family* $\mathcal{C}(S) = \{(C_s, \overline{C}_s) : s \in S, s$ *regular*$\}$ *is said to be an* S-cover *of* G*.* □

With a little abuse of notation, we also say that some clique C belongs to an S-cover $\mathcal{C}(S)$ if $C \in \{C_s, \overline{C}_s\}$ for some pair $(C_s, \overline{C}_s) \in \mathcal{C}(S)$. Let $\mathcal{F}(S)$ be the family of free components with respect to the canonical stable set S, as defined in Definition 21. When no confusion arises we simply write $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{F}$ instead of $\mathcal{C}(S)$ and $\mathcal{F}(S)$.

Theorem 51 *Let* $G(V, E)$ *be a claw-free graph and* S *a canonical stable set of* G*. Let* $\mathcal{C}$ *and* $\mathcal{F}$ *be an* S*-cover and the family of free components of* G*, respectively. Then each node* $u \in V$ *is contained in* at most *four cliques of* $\mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{F}$*.*

Proof. First observe that the only cliques in $\mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{F}$ containing a regular stable node u are $C_u, \overline{C}_u \in \mathcal{C}$ while no clique in $\mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{F}$ contains an irregular stable node. Moreover, the only cliques in $\mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{F}$ possibly containing a bound node $u \in W(s, t)$ are $C_s, \overline{C}_s, C_t, \overline{C}_t$ and, finally, each free node $u \in F(s)$ belongs to at most one free component and to at most two cliques in $\mathcal{C}$ (namely $C_s, \overline{C}_s$). □

Theorem 52 *Let* $G(V, E)$ *be a claw-free graph and* S *a canonical stable set of* G*. Then an* S*-cover* $\mathcal{C}$ *and the family* $\mathcal{F}$ *of* G *can be constructed in* $\mathcal{O}(|V|^2)$ *time.*

Proof. We first show that an S-cover $\mathcal{C}$ can be constructed in $\mathcal{O}(|V|^2)$. In fact, for each $s \in S$, in $\mathcal{O}(|N(s)|^2)$ time we can either find two maximal cliques covering $N(s)$ or conclude that s is not regular. Moreover, since each node $v \in V$ is adjacent to at most two nodes in S, we have $\sum_{s \in S} |N(s)|^2 \leq 4|V|^2$. As to $\mathcal{F}$, observe that in $\mathcal{O}(|E|)$ time we can construct the set $F(S)$ of free nodes with respect to S and partition $F(S)$ into free similarity classes. In turn, this allows us to construct in

$\mathcal{O}(|E|)$ time the free dissimilarity graph of G and hence, in $\mathcal{O}(|V|^2)$ time, the list of the connected components of such a graph which are cliques. Finally, again in $\mathcal{O}(|V|^2)$ time, we can remove from such a list the cliques which are not maximal. □

Theorem 53 *Let $G(V, E)$ be a claw-free graph, S a canonical stable set of G and $\mathcal{F}$ the family of the free components of G with respect to S. A weakly normal clique Q of G either belongs to $\mathcal{F}$ or contains a regular stable node s. Moreover, if Q is* normal *then $N[s]$ is* uniquely *covered by two maximal cliques one of which is Q and, consequently, Q belongs to every S-cover of G.*

Proof. Since Q is weakly normal, for each node $v \in Q$ we have that $N[v] \setminus Q$ is a clique (each node in Q is regular). Moreover, if Q is normal then $N[v]$ is uniquely covered by two maximal cliques one of which is Q ([1]). Suppose that Q is a soft clique and that there exists two maximal cliques H and K covering $N[v]$ and different from Q and $\bar{Q} = N[v] \setminus Q$. Let $Q_H = Q \cap H$ and $Q_K = Q \cap K$ and let $h \in H \setminus Q$ and $k \in K \setminus Q$. The nodes h and k exist since $H, K \neq Q$ and belong to $\bar{Q} \setminus Q$. Moreover, since Q is maximal, there exist nodes, $\bar{h}, \bar{k} \in Q$ that are non-adjacent to h and k, respectively. But then, for each node $y \in Q_H \setminus \{v\}$ the pair $\{v, y\}$ is universal to the stable pair $\{h, \bar{h}\}$ and for each node $y \in Q_K \setminus \{v\}$ the pair $\{v, y\}$ is universal to the stable pair $\{k, \bar{k}\}$. It follows that, for each node $y \in Q \setminus \{v\}$, the edge vy is rigid contradicting the assumption that Q is soft in G. Hence, we can conclude that if Q contains a stable node s then s is regular and, if Q is normal or soft in G, then $N[s]$ is uniquely covered by two maximal cliques one of which is Q.

Assume now that $Q \cap S = \emptyset$ and suppose, by contradiction, that there exists a bound node $v \in Q$. Let $W(s, t)$ be the wing containing v. Both s and t belong to $N(Q)$ and are adjacent to the node $v \in Q$. But this contradicts the assumption that Q is weakly normal, since s and t are non-adjacent. It follows that Q contains only free nodes, each one of them adjacent to some node in S, so $S' = N(Q) \cap S \neq \emptyset$. We have that S' contains at least two nodes, since otherwise the unique node in S' would be universal to Q, contradicting its maximality. It follows that Q is contained in some connected component C of G_F. If C is a clique, then $Q \equiv C$ belongs to $\mathcal{F}$ and the theorem follows. Otherwise there exists a node $x \in C \setminus Q$ adjacent to some dissimilar node $y \in Q$. But then x and $S(y)$ are non-adjacent nodes in $N(y) \setminus Q$, contradicting the assumption that Q is weakly normal. □

6 Lifting soft cliques: from claw-free to quasi-line

Definition 61 *Let $G(V, E)$ be a graph. An edge $uv \in E$ is* rigid *if both u and v are adjacent to two non-adjacent nodes x and y. Let $E_R \subseteq E$ be the set of rigid edges of G. The graph $G_R(V, E_R)$ is said to be the* rigid structure *of G and an induced subgraph $G[U]$ ($U \subseteq V$) is said to be* rigid in G *if $G_R[U]$ is connected,* soft in G *otherwise.* □

Theorem 61 *Let $G(V, E)$ be a graph. A maximal clique Q which is* soft *in G is liftable with respect to the partition of Q (*rigid partition*) into the connected components $\mathcal{K} = \{K_1, K_2, \ldots, K_p\}$ ($p \geq 2$) of $G_R[Q]$.*

Proof. Suppose that property *(i)* of Definition 44 is not satisfied and there exist two non-adjacent nodes $u, v \in N(Q)$ with a common neighbor $z \in Q$. Let $\bar{u}$ and $\bar{v}$ be nodes in Q non-adjacent to u and v, respectively. By claw freeness, each node $y \in Q \setminus \{z\}$ is adjacent either to u or to v and hence the edge yz is rigid since y and z are adjacent either to $\{u, \bar{u}\}$ or to $\{v, \bar{v}\}$. It follows that $G_R[Q]$ is connected contradicting the hypothesis that Q is not rigid in G. Suppose now that property *(ii)* is not satisfied and let $x \in K_i$, $y \in K_j$ ($i \neq j$, $K_i, K_j \in \mathcal{K}$) be the base of a Q-paw $(x, y : z, h)$. Let $\bar{z}$ be a node in Q non-adjacent to z. But then xy is rigid since both x and y are universal to $\{z, \bar{z}\}$, a contradiction. Finally, suppose that property *(iii)* is not satisfied and let $x \in K_i$, $y \in K_j$, $z \in K_t$ ($i \neq j \neq t \neq i$, $K_i, K_j, K_t \in \mathcal{K}$) be nodes with a common neighbor z in $N(Q)$. Let $\bar{z}$ be a node in Q non-adjacent to z. But then xy is rigid since both x and y are universal to $\{z, \bar{z}\}$, a contradiction. ☐

We are now going to show that the family of maximal soft cliques in a claw free graph contains $\mathcal{O}(|V|)$ elements and that all such cliques can be successively lifted in $\mathcal{O}(|V|^2)$ time, producing a lifted graph G_L and a canonical S-matching M_L with the property that each irregular node of G is contained in a shrinkable component C of G_L with $\alpha(C) \leq 3$. As a consequence, by shrinking all the shrinkable components with stability number at most three we will be able to turn the claw-free graph G_L into a quasi-line graph G_{QL}. Let us start by proving that a claw-free graph G contains $\mathcal{O}(|V|)$ maximal soft cliques.

Theorem 62 *Let $G(V, E)$ be a claw-free graph, S a canonical stable set of G, $\mathcal{C}$ any S-cover of G and $\mathcal{F}$ the family of the free components of G with respect to S. Then a maximal* soft *clique Q belongs to $\mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{F}$.*

Proof. By Theorem 61, a maximal soft clique Q is liftable and hence weakly normal. It follows, by Theorem 53, that either Q belongs to $\mathcal{F}$ or it contains a regular node $v \in S$. In the second case suppose, by contradiction that Q does not belong to $\mathcal{C}$ and hence that there exist two maximal cliques H and K covering $N[v]$ and different from Q and $\bar{Q}$, with $\bar{Q}$ any maximal clique containing $N[v] \setminus Q$. Let $Q_H = Q \cap H$ and $Q_K = Q \cap K$ and let $h \in H \setminus Q$ and $k \in K \setminus Q$. The nodes h and k exist since $H, K \neq Q$ and belong to $\bar{Q} \setminus Q$. Moreover, since Q is maximal, there exist nodes, $\bar{h}, \bar{k} \in Q$ that are non-adjacent to h and k, respectively. But then, for each node $y \in Q_H \setminus \{v\}$ the pair $\{v, y\}$ is universal to the stable pair $\{h, \bar{h}\}$ and for each node $y \in Q_K \setminus \{v\}$ the pair $\{v, y\}$ is universal to the stable pair $\{k, \bar{k}\}$. It follows that, for each node $y \in Q \setminus \{v\}$, the edge vy is rigid contradicting the assumption that Q is soft in G. ☐

In the next theorem we prove that the family of all the maximal soft cliques can be constructed in $\mathcal{O}(|V|^2)$ time.

Theorem 63 *Let $G(V, E)$ be a claw-free graph and S a canonical stable set of G. The family $\mathcal{S}$ of maximal soft cliques of G along with the corresponding rigid partitions can be constructed in $\mathcal{O}(|V|^2)$ time.*

Proof. By Theorem 53 the maximal soft cliques of G belong to $\mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{F}$, where $\mathcal{C}$ is any S-cover of G and $\mathcal{F}$ is the family of the free components of G with respect to S. By Theorem 52 $\mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{F}$ can be constructed in $\mathcal{O}(|V|^2)$ time; moreover observe that $\mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{F}$ contains $\mathcal{O}(|V|)$ elements. Then, in overall time $\mathcal{O}(|V|^2)$, we construct the list $\{\mathcal{L}_u : u \in V\}$, where $\mathcal{L}_u$ is the family of cliques in $\mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{F}$ containing the node u. Observe that, by Theorem 51, $|\mathcal{L}_u| \leq 4$.

For each node $u \in V$ and each clique $Q \in \mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{F} \setminus \mathcal{L}_u$ let $\mathit{Root}[u, Q]$ be a node in Q adjacent to u (if any). Moreover, for each clique $Q \in \mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{F}$, let $G_Q(Q, E_Q)$ be the spanning subgraph of $G[Q]$ with $xy \in E_Q$ if and only if there exists a node $u \in N(Q)$ satisfying $x = \mathit{Root}[u, Q]$ and $y \in N(u) \cap Q$. We have the following:

Claim (i). The matrix $\mathit{Root}[\cdot, \cdot]$ *and the graphs* G_Q $(Q \in \mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{F})$ *can be computed in* $\mathcal{O}(|V|^2)$ *time.*

Proof. Initialize the graphs G_Q by letting, for each $Q \in \mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{F}$, $E_Q = \emptyset$. Now, for each edge $uv \in E$, each clique $Q^u \in \mathcal{L}_u \setminus \mathcal{L}_v$ and each clique $Q^v \in \mathcal{L}_v \setminus \mathcal{L}_u$ let $\mathit{Root}[u, Q^v] := v$ and $\mathit{Root}[v, Q^u] := u$. Finally, for each node $u \in V$, scan the nodes $v \in N(u)$ and for each $Q \in \mathcal{L}_v$ add to E_Q the edge $(v, \mathit{Root}[u, Q])$ (if $v \neq \mathit{Root}[u, Q]$). Evidently the above procedure produces the matrix $\mathit{Root}[\cdot, \cdot]$ and the graphs G_Q in overall time $\mathcal{O}(|V|^2)$.
End of Claim (i).

Claim (ii). For each $Q \in \mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{F}$ *the graph* G_Q *is connected if and only if* Q *is rigid.*

Proof. First observe that each edge $xy \in E_Q$ is rigid. In fact, there exist a node $u \in N(Q)$ with $x = \mathit{Root}[u, Q]$ and $y \in N(u) \cap Q$. Moreover, since Q is maximal, there exists a node $\bar{u} \in Q$ which is not adjacent to u (and adjacent to both x and y). It follows that Q is rigid if G_Q is connected. Suppose now that G_Q is not connected and let $(K_1, \ldots, K_p)$ be the connected components of G_Q. We claim that Q is soft with lifting partition $(K_1, \ldots, K_p)$. Suppose not and let $xy \in E$ be a rigid edge with $x \in K_i$ and $y \in K_j$ $(1 \leq i < j \leq p)$. Let $\bar{u} = \mathit{Root}[u, Q]$. Since $xy \notin E_Q$, $\bar{u} \neq x, y$. But then the edges $x\bar{u}$ and $y\bar{u}$ belong to E_Q and so x and y are connected, contradicting the assumption.
End of Claim (ii).

To complete the proof observe that in $\mathcal{O}(|V|^2)$ time we can list the connected components of the graphs G_Q for each $Q \in \mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{F}$ and produce the family $\mathcal{S}$ of the soft cliques of G along with the corresponding lifting partitions. ☐

Theorem 64 *Let* $G(V, E)$ *be a graph and let* Q *be a maximal soft clique in* G. *Let* $G^{(Q,\mathcal{K})}$ *be the lifting of* Q *in* G *with respect to the rigid partition* $\mathcal{K} = \{K_1, K_2, \ldots, K_p\}$. *Let* $M = \{q_i\bar{q}_i : i = 1, \ldots p\}$ *be the set of lifting edges. Then any edge with at least one end-node in* $V(M)$ *is soft in* $G^{(Q,\mathcal{K})}$ *and an edge* $uv \in E$ *is rigid in* $G^{(Q,\mathcal{K})}$ *if and only if it is rigid in* G.

Proof. Observe that, as a consequence of the fact that the lifting edges are bisimplicial, any edge in $G^{(Q,\mathcal{K})}$ with at least one end-node in $V(M)$ is soft. Hence, only the edges in E can possibly be rigid in $G^{(Q,\mathcal{K})}$. Assume that some edge $uv \in E$ changes its status after the lifting of Q with respect to $\mathcal{K}$.

First, assume that uv is not rigid in G and rigid in $G^{(Q,\mathcal{K})}$ and let x, y be non-adjacent nodes in $G^{(Q,\mathcal{K})}$ which are universal to $\{u, v\}$. If the edge xy have been removed by the lifting then we have $x \in K_i$ and $y \in K_j$ for some pair of sets $K_i, K_j \in \mathcal{K}$ $(i \neq j)$. But then we have $u \notin Q$, otherwise either ux or uy (or both) would have been removed by the lifting. Let $\bar{u} \in Q$ be a node non-adjacent to u. We have that $u, \bar{u}$ is a pair of non-adjacent nodes in G universal to $\{x, y\}$, so xy is a rigid edge in G, contradicting the assumption that $\mathcal{K}$ is the rigid partition of

Q. It follows that xy is not an edge of G. As a consequence, one node in $\{x,y\}$ must be a lifting node, otherwise uv would have been rigid also in G. Assume that $x \equiv q_i$ is the lifting node universal to $K_i \in \mathcal{K}$. Hence, we have $\{u,v\} \subseteq K_i$ and, since there is only one lifting node adjacent to K_i (namely x) and y is non-adjacent to x, the node y belongs to $V \setminus Q$. Let $\bar{y}$ be any node in Q non-adjacent to y. We have that $\{y,\bar{y}\}$ is a pair of non-adjacent nodes in G universal to $\{u,v\}$, so uv is a rigid edge in G, contradicting the assumption. Hence, we can conclude that any edge which is rigid in $G^{(Q,\mathcal{K})}$ is also rigid in G.

Assume now that uv is not rigid in $G^{(Q,\mathcal{K})}$ and rigid in G and let x,y be non-adjacent nodes in G which are universal to $\{u,v\}$. Since $\{x,y\} \subset V$ and the lifting does not add any edge with both end-nodes in V, we have that some edge in $\{xu,xv,yu,yv\}$ is removed by the lifting. Assume that xu is removed. It follows that we have $x \in K_i$ and $u \in K_j$ for some pair of sets $K_i, K_j \in \mathcal{K}$ $(i \neq j)$. Assume that v does not belong to Q and let $\bar{v}$ be any node in Q non-adjacent to v. We have that $\{v,\bar{v}\}$ is a pair of non-adjacent nodes universal to xu, contradicting the assumption that $\mathcal{K}$ is the rigid partition of Q. It follows that v belongs to Q and in particular, since the edge uv is not removed by the lifting, $v \in K_j$. Moreover, since xy does not belong to E, we have $y \notin Q$. Let q_j be the lifting node universal to K_j in $G^{(Q,\mathcal{K})}$. We have that $\{q_j,y\}$ is a pair of non-adjacent nodes in $G^{(Q,\mathcal{K})}$ universal to uv, contradicting the assumption that uv is soft in $G^{(Q,\mathcal{K})}$. The theorem follows. □

Lemma 61 *Let $G(V,E)$ be a graph and let Q be a maximal soft clique in G. Let $G^{(Q,\mathcal{K})}$ be the lifting of Q in G with respect to the rigid partition $\mathcal{K}$. Then any subset $H \neq Q$ of V is a soft maximal clique of $G^{(Q,\mathcal{K})}$ if and only if it is a soft maximal clique of G.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{K} = \{K_1, K_2, \dots, K_p\}$ $(p \geq 2)$, let $\{\overline{q}_1, \dots, \overline{q}_p\}$ be the corresponding lifting clique and let $q_i\overline{q}_i$ $(i = 1,\dots,p)$ be the lifting edges. Let $H \neq Q$ be a subset of V. We claim that H is a maximal clique in G if and only if it is a maximal clique in $G^{(Q,\mathcal{K})}$. In fact, assume that H is a maximal clique in G and not in $G^{(Q,\mathcal{K})}$. Since the lifting operation only adds edges with one end-node in Q and H is not a subset of Q we have that H is not a clique in $G^{(Q,\mathcal{K})}$. Let uv be an edge with $\{u,v\} \subset Q \cap H$ removed by the lifting operation (uv is a soft edge). Since Q and H are maximal cliques in G we have that there exist a node z in $Q \setminus \{u,v\}$ and a node $\bar{z}$ in $H \setminus \{u,v\}$ such that $z\bar{z} \notin E$. It follows that uv is a rigid edge in G, a contradiction. Consequently, H is a maximal clique also in $G^{(Q,\mathcal{K})}$. Assume now that H is a maximal clique in $G^{(Q,\mathcal{K})}$. Observe that $H \setminus Q \neq \emptyset$, otherwise we would have $H \subseteq K_i$ for some $i \in \{1,\dots,p\}$, contradicting the maximality of H. If H is not a maximal clique in G, there exists a node z which is universal to H in G and is not adjacent to a node $u \in H$ in $G^{(Q,\mathcal{K})}$. It follows that $\{z,u\}$ is a subset of Q and zu is a soft edge in G. Let v be a node in $H \setminus Q$ and $\bar{v}$ a node in Q with $v\bar{v} \notin E$. But then $\{v,\bar{v}\}$ is universal to $\{z,u\}$ contradicting the assumption that zu is soft in G. Hence, H is a maximal clique in G if and only if it is a maximal clique in $G^{(Q,\mathcal{K})}$. Moreover, by Theorem 64, every edge in H is soft in $G^{(Q,\mathcal{K})}$ if and only if it is soft in G. Hence, H is a soft maximal clique of $G^{(Q,\mathcal{K})}$ if and only if it is a soft maximal clique of G. The theorem follows. □

Let $\mathcal{S} = \{Q_1,\dots,Q_t\}$ be the family of maximal soft cliques of G. The above lemma shows that we can lift in any order the cliques in $\mathcal{S}$ obtaining a graph G_L

and a canonical matching M_L. In the following lemma we are going to prove some important properties of G_L.

Lemma 62 *Let $G(V,E)$ be a claw-free graph. Then in $\mathcal{O}(|V|^2)$ time we can construct the graph G_L and the canonical matching M_L. Moreover,* (i) *every maximal clique in $G_L - V(M_L)$ is rigid and* (ii) *two nodes in $V(M_L)$ are adjacent if and only if they are either matched by M_L or both belong to an M_L-clique.*

Proof. By Theorem 64, the rigid structures of the graphs G and G_L are essentially the same (the latter is obtained by adding the nodes in $V(M_L)$ as isolated nodes to the former). Since G_L is obtained by lifting all the maximal soft cliques in G, it follows easily that any maximal clique in $G_L - V(M_L)$ is rigid.

Let u, v be nodes in $V(M_L)$. If they are matched by M_L or belong to an M_L-clique then obviously they are adjacent. On the other hand, if both u and v are produced by lifting some clique Q and are adjacent then they define a lifting edge or belong to the lifting clique. Assume, conversely, that u and v are produced by two different liftings and are adjacent. Without loss of generality, assume that node u is produced before node v and that v and the edge uv are produced by lifting some clique $\tilde{Q}$ in an intermediate graph $\tilde{G}$. It follows that $\tilde{Q}$ in $\tilde{G}$ contains u, but this contradicts the assumption that G_L has been obtained by lifting only cliques belonging to G. It follows that u and v are adjacent if and only if they are produced by the same lifting and either define a lifting edge or belong to the lifting clique.

By Theorem 63 we construct in $\mathcal{O}(|V|^2)$ time the list $\mathcal{S} = \{Q_1, \ldots, Q_t\}$ of maximal soft cliques in G and the corresponding rigid partitions $\mathcal{K}_i = \{K_{i1}, \ldots, K_{ip_i}\}$ $(i = 1, \ldots, t)$. Each clique $Q_i \in \mathcal{S}$ can be lifted in $\mathcal{O}(|Q_i|^2)$ time. Moreover, if a node $u \in V$ belongs to three cliques in $\mathcal{S}$, say Q_i, Q_j and Q_h, we have that it also belongs to three members of the corresponding rigid partitions $\mathcal{K}_i$, $\mathcal{K}_j$ and $\mathcal{K}_h$. Without loss of generality, assume $u \in K_{i1} \cap K_{j1} \cap K_{h1}$ and let q_{i1}, q_{j1} and q_{h1} be the lifting nodes universal to such sets. But then u is adjacent in G_L to the nodes $qi1$, q_{j1} and q_{h1} which are produced by the lifting of three distinct cliques and hence, by property *(ii)*, mutually non-adjacent. But this contradicts the fact that G_L is claw-free. It follows that any node in V belongs to at most two cliques of the list and hence the overall complexity of the lifting procedure is $\mathcal{O}(|V|^2)$ time. The theorem follows. □

Theorem 65 *Let $G(V,E)$ be a connected claw-free graph with $\alpha(G)) \geq 4$ and $M \subseteq E$ a canonical matching of G. If* (i) *every maximal clique of $G - V(M)$ is rigid and* (ii) *two nodes $u, v \in V(M)$ are adjacent if and only if they are either matched by M or both belong to an M-clique, then every irregular node v_0 belongs to a connected component C of the graph $G - M$ with $|C \cap V(M)| \leq 2$ and $\alpha(G[C \setminus V(M)]) \leq 3$.*

Proof. If v_0 is an irregular node then it is the hub of a 5-wheel $(v_0 : v_1, \ldots, v_5)$ in G ([2]). Let $R = \{v_1, \ldots, v_5\}$ be its rim. For each $i = 1, \ldots, 5$, let $U_i = \{u : N(u) \cap R = \{v_i, v_{i+1}\}\}$ (sums taken modulo 5) and $U = \bigcup_{i=1,\ldots,5} U_i$. By claw-freeness, U_i is a clique for each $i \in \{1, \ldots, 5\}$ and each node in $N^2(R)$ is adjacent to some node in U. Let $\bar{U}_i = \{u \in U_i : N(u) \cap N^2(R) \neq \emptyset$ and $\bar{U} = \bigcup_{i=1,\ldots,5} \bar{U}_i$. Evidently, $N(\bar{U}) \setminus N[R] = N^2(R)$.

Let C be the connected component of $G - M$ containing the node v_0. Since every node in an M-clique is regular, C is not an M-clique. Since every edge v_0v_i ($i = 1, \ldots, 5$) is rigid and every edge v_iz is rigid for each $z \in N(R)$ with $N(z) \cap R = \{v_{i-1}, v_i, v_{i+1}\}$, we have that all the nodes of $N[R] \setminus U$ belong to the rigid subgraph containing v_0. Since the edges in $\delta(C)$ belong to M and are not rigid, $N[R] \setminus U$ belong to C. We have two cases: *(a)* either U_i or U_{i+1} is empty for each $i = 1, \ldots, 5$; *(b)* both U_i and U_{i+1} are non-empty for some $i = 1, \ldots, 5$. In both cases we show that $|C \cap V(M)| \leq 2$ and $C \setminus V(M) \subseteq N[R]$, implying $\alpha(G[C \setminus V(M)]) \leq 3$.

Case (1). Either U_i or U_{i+1} is empty for each $i = 1, \ldots, 5$.

If $\bar{U}$ is empty then $V = N[R]$ and $\alpha(G) = 3$, contradicting the hypothesis. Hence, without loss of generality, we can assume $\bar{U}_1 \neq \emptyset$. By assumption we have $U_2 = U_5 = \emptyset$. Moreover, U_3 and U_4 cannot be both non-empty so, again without loss of generality, assume $U_4 = \emptyset$.

Let $X = N[x] \cap N[v_1] \cap N[v_2]$ for some $x \in \bar{U}_1$. Analogously, let $Y = N[y] \cap N[v_3] \cap N[v_4]$ for some $y \in \bar{U}_3$ (Y empty if $\bar{U}_3 = \emptyset$).

Claim (1.i). X and Y are maximal cliques and $\bar{U} \subseteq X \cup Y$.

Proof. Observe first that any node $x' \in U_1 \setminus \{x\}$ is adjacent to x, otherwise $(v_1 : v_0, x, x')$ would be a claw. It follows that we have $\bar{U}_1 \subseteq U_1 \subseteq X$ and, by a similar argument, $\bar{U}_3 \subseteq Y$. Since $\bar{U}_2 = \bar{U}_4 = \bar{U}_5 = \emptyset$, we have $\bar{U} \subseteq X \cup Y$. Assume now, by contradiction, that X is not a clique and contains two non-adjacent nodes z and z'. Let $\bar{x}$ be a node in $N(x) \cap N^2(R)$. Since x is adjacent to every node in X we have $z \neq x \neq z'$, $zx \in E$ and $z'x \in E$. We have that either z or z' is adjacent to $\bar{x}$ (otherwise $(x : z, z', \bar{x})$ would be a claw). Assume, without loss of generality, $z\bar{x} \in E$. We have $zv_3 \notin E$ (otherwise $(z : v_1, v_3, \bar{x})$ would be a claw) and $zv_5 \notin E$ (otherwise $(z : v_2, v_5, \bar{x})$ would be a claw). It follows that z' is adjacent to both v_3 and v_5 (otherwise either $(v_2 : z, z', v_3)$ or $(v_1 : z, z', v_5)$ would be a claw). But then $(z' : x, v_3, v_5)$ is a claw in G, a contradiction. Hence X is a clique and, by a similar argument, Y is a clique. Moreover, X and Y are maximal, since any node not in X is not universal to $\{x, v_1, v_2\} \subseteq X$ and any node not in Y is not universal to $\{y, v_3, v_4\} \subseteq Y$.
End of Claim (1.i).

Let $V_1 = N[R] \setminus \bar{U}$, $V_2 = V \setminus V_1$, let $X_i = V_i \cap X$ and let $Y_i = V_i \cap Y$ ($i = 1, 2$). Since $\bar{U}_1$ is non-empty we have $X_2 \neq \emptyset$.

Claim (1.ii). Let $u \in V_1$ and $v \in V_2$ be adjacent nodes. Then either $u \in X_1$ and $v \in X_2$ or $u \in Y_1$ and $v \in Y_2$.

Proof. Observe first that v belongs to $\bar{U}$. In fact, if $v \notin \bar{U}$ we have $v \notin N[R]$ and hence $u \notin R$. Since $u \in N(R)$, by claw freeness we have $|N(u) \cap R| = 2$, contradicting the assumption that $u \notin \bar{U}$. By Claim *(1.i)* and definition of (V_1, V_2), we have $\bar{U} \subseteq X_2 \cup Y_2$. Since v belongs to $\bar{U}$, it is adjacent to a node $t \in N^2(R)$. Assume, without loss of generality, that v belongs to X_2 and hence that $N(v) \cap R = \{v_1, v_2\}$. Suppose $u \notin X$; it follows that u is not in $N[x] \cap N[v_1] \cap N[v_2]$ and hence $u \notin \{x, v_1, v_2\}$. Moreover, u is adjacent to both v_1 and v_2 (otherwise either $(v : u, t, v_1)$ or $(v : u, t, v_2)$ would be a claw) and hence it is not adjacent to x. But u is not universal to $\{v_3, v_5\}$ (otherwise $(u : v, v_3, v_5)$ would be a claw) and hence

either $(v_1 : u, v_5, x)$ or $(v_2 : u, v_3, x)$ is a claw in G, a contradiction. It follows that u belongs to $X \cap V_1 = X_1$ as claimed.
End of Claim (1.ii).

Claim (1.iii). There exists a node $z \in V(M)$ such that $X \cap V(M) = X_2 = \{z\}$; if Y is non-empty then there exists a node $q \in V(M)$ such that $Y \cap V(M) = Y_2 = \{q\}$.

Proof. We claim that each edge uv with $u \in X_1$ and $v \in X_2$ is not rigid in G. Suppose the contrary and let $t, \bar{t}$ be non-adjacent nodes universal to $\{u, v\}$. By claw-freeness, either t or $\bar{t}$ belongs to X. Without loss of generality, we can assume $\bar{t} \in X$. If t belongs to V_1, since $v \in X_2$ and $tv \in E$ we have, by Claim *(1.ii)*, $t \in X_1$. If, conversely, t belongs to V_2, since $u \in X_1$ and $tu \in E$ we have $t \in X_2$. In both cases $t \in X$, contradicting the assumption $t\bar{t} \notin E$. It follows that X is a soft clique. Since, by hypothesis, every maximal clique in $G - V(M)$ is rigid, we have that X contains a node $z \in V(M)$. Let $\bar{z}$ be the node matched to z by M. Since $z\bar{z}$ is strongly bisimplicial, we have that $\bar{z} \notin X$ (otherwise both z and $\bar{z}$ would be adjacent to v_1) and, by Lemma 62, we have that z is not adjacent to a node $z' \in V(M) \setminus \{\bar{z}\}$. It follows that $X \cap V(M) = \{z\}$. We have $z \in N(R)$ and $\bar{z} \notin N(R)$, hence $z \in \bar{U}$. It follows that z belongs to X_2 and, since $X \setminus V(M)$ is rigid and any edge with an endpoint in X_1 and the other in X_2 is not rigid we have $X \setminus V(M) \equiv X \setminus \{z\} = X_1$ and $X_2 = \{z\}$. Analogously, if Y is non-empty then it is a soft clique, contains a unique node $q \in V(M)$ and has the property that $Y \cap V(M) = Y_2 = \{q\}$.
End of Claim (1.iii).

Let $\bar{z}$ be the node matched to z by M and, if $Y \neq \emptyset$, let $\bar{q}$ be the node matched to q by M. By the above claims, any path connecting a node $u \in V_1$ with a node $v \in V_2$ must contain either the edge $z\bar{z}$ or the edge $q\bar{q}$. It follows that $V_1 \cup X_2 \cup Y_2$ is a connected component of $G - M$ and hence coincides with C.

Claim (1.iv). Each node $t \in V(M) \cap C$ belongs to $\bar{U}$.

Proof. Let $\bar{t}$ be the node matched by M to t. Since $C = V_1 \cup X_2 \cup Y_2 = N[R]$, we have $t \in N[R]$. Observe that the neighborhood of any node in $V(M)$ does not contain an induced P_3. Hence, since each node in $N[R] \setminus U$ contains an induced P_3 in its neighborhood, we have $t \in U$. Finally, since $\bar{t}$ does not belong to $N[R]$, we have $t \in \bar{U}$ as claimed.
End of Claim (1.iv).

By the above claim $C \cap V(M) \subseteq \bar{U}$. On the other hand, by Claims *(1.i)* and *(1.iii)*, $\bar{U} \subseteq C \cap V(M)$, so we have $C \cap V(M) = \bar{U}$. In particular, we have $\bar{U} = X_2 \cup Y_2$ and, by Claim *(1.iii)*, $X_2 = \{z\}$ and Y_2 is either empty or consists of $\{q\}$ $(z \neq q)$. The theorem follows.
End of Case (1).

Case (2). Both U_i and U_{i+1} are non-empty for some $i = 1, \ldots, 5$.

Assume, without loss of generality, that U_3 and U_4 are non-empty and let $u_1 \in U_3$ and $u_2 \in U_4$. By claw-freeness u_1 is adjacent to u_2 in $\bar{G}$ (otherwise $(v_4 : v_0, u_1, u_2)$ would be a claw) and, consequently, the node-set $H = \{v_0, v_1, \ldots, v_5, u_1, u_2\}$ induces a gear in $\bar{G}$ with v_4 hub of the 5-wheel $(v_4 : v_0, v_3, u_1, u_2, v_5)$ with rim $R' = \{v_0, v_3, u_1, u_2, v_5\}$. Observe that the edges u_1v_4 and u_2v_4 are rigid, so u_1 and u_2 belong to the rigid subgraph containing v_4 and hence to C.

Let $T = \{x \in N(H) : |N(x) \cap H| = 2$ and $\bar{T} = \{x \in T : N(x) \setminus N[H] \neq \emptyset$. By claw-freeness, every node $u \in N^2(H)$ is adjacent to a node of $\bar{T}$. Moreover, since G is connected, we have that if $\bar{T}$ is empty then $V = N[H]$. The following claim describes some properties of T.

Claim (2.i). Each node $z \in V(M) \cap N[H]$ belongs to T and each node $u \in T$ satisfies either $N(u) \cap H = \{v_1, v_2\}$ or $N(u) \cap H = \{u_1, u_2\}$.

Proof. The fact that each node $z \in V(M) \cap N[H]$ belongs to T follows from the easy observation that the neighborhood of a node $z \in V(M)$ does not contain an induced P_3 while, on the contrary, each node in $N[H] \setminus T$ contains an induced P_3. To prove that each node $x \in T$ satisfies either $N(x) \cap H = \{v_1, v_2\}$ or $N(x) \cap H = \{u_1, u_2\}$, observe that, by claw-freeness, if x belongs to $N(R)$ it must be adjacent to at least two consecutive nodes of R. An analogous property holds for R'. Again by claw-freeness, x is not adjacent to v_0 and v_4 since, otherwise, it would be adjacent to three consecutive nodes of R or R'. It follows that x is not adjacent to v_3 for, otherwise, it should be adjacent to v_2 and u_1 contradicting the assumption that $|N(x) \cap H| = 2$. Analogously, x is not adjacent to v_5. It follows that either $N(x) \cap H = \{v_1, v_2\}$ or $N(x) \cap H = \{u_1, u_2\}$. *End of Claim (2.i).*

Let $X = N[x] \cap N[u_1] \cap N[u_2]$ for some $x \in T \cap N(u_1) \cap N(u_2)$ (X empty if $T \cap N(u_1) \cap N(u_2) = \emptyset$). Analogously, let $Y = N[y] \cap N[v_1] \cap N[v_2]$ for some $y \in T \cap N(v_1) \cap N(v_2)$ (Y empty if $T \cap N(v_1) \cap N(v_2) = \emptyset$).

Claim (2.ii). X and Y are maximal cliques and $T \subseteq X \cup Y$.

Proof. We first prove that $T \subseteq X \cup Y$. Let u be a node in T. By Claim *(2.i)*, we have that either $N(u) \cap H = \{v_1, v_2\}$ or $N(u) \cap H = \{u_1, u_2\}$. It follows that u belongs either to X or to Y (not both) and hence that $T \subseteq X \cup Y$.

We now prove that X is a maximal clique. Suppose first that both X and Y are non-empty and assume, by contradiction, that X is not a clique and contains two non-adjacent nodes z and z'. Since x is adjacent to every node in X we have $z \neq x \neq z'$, $zx \in E$ and $z'x \in E$. Moreover, x is non-adjacent to R (it is adjacent only to u_1 and u_2 in H). It follows, by claw-freeness, that z and z' are adjacent to at most two (consecutive) nodes of R and hence that neither z nor z' are adjacent to v_0 (otherwise, again by claw-freeness, they should be adjacent to at least three consecutive nodes of R).

We have that either z or z' must be adjacent to v_4 (otherwise $(u_1 : z, z', v_4)$ would be a claw) but not both (otherwise $(v_4 : z, z', v_0)$ would be a claw). Moreover, either z or z' (but not both, as above) must be adjacent to v_3 (otherwise $(u_1 : z, z', v_3)$ would be a claw) and v_5 (otherwise $(u_1 : z, z', v_5)$ would be a claw). Assume, without loss of generality, that z is adjacent to v_3 and v_4 and not adjacent to v_5 while z' is adjacent to v_5 and not adjacent to v_3 and v_4. The node z' is adjacent to v_1 (otherwise $(v_5 : v_1, v_4, z')$ would be a claw) and hence $N(z) \cap R = \{v_3, v_4\}$ and $N(z') \cap R = \{v_1, v_5\}$.

Since $Y \neq \emptyset$ there exists a node y in $T \cap N(v_1) \cap N(v_2)$. Hence $N(y) \cap R = \{v_1, v_2\}$ and $yv_0 \notin E$. But then $z'y \in E$ (otherwise $(v_1 : y, z', v_0)$ would be a claw) and, consequently, $(z' : y, u_1, v_5)$ is a claw in G, a contradiction.

Suppose now that either X or Y is empty. Assume first that both X and $Y \cap \bar{T}$ are empty. Each node in $N[H] \setminus N[R]$ is adjacent to u_1 and u_2 and belongs to X. Since

X is empty, we have $N[H] = N[R]$. Moreover, since $T \subseteq X \cup Y$ and X is empty we have that $\bar{T} \subseteq T \subseteq Y$ and hence $\bar{T} = \emptyset$. Consequently, $N^2(H) = N^2(R) = \emptyset$ and hence $V = N[H] = N[R]$. But then $\alpha(G) = 3$ contradicting the hypothesis that $\alpha(G) \geq 4$. Analogously Y and $X \cap \bar{T}$ cannot be both empty. Since either X or Y is empty, we are left with the symmetric cases *(1)* $Y = \emptyset$ and $X \cap \bar{T} \neq \emptyset$ ($X \neq \emptyset$) and *(2)* $X = \emptyset$ and $Y \cap \bar{T} \neq \emptyset$ ($Y \neq \emptyset$). We now show that in the first case we get a contradiction and omit an analogous proof for the second case.

Assume, by contradiction, that X is not a clique and contains two non-adjacent nodes z and z' ($z \neq x \neq z'$). We have that v_3 is adjacent either to z or to z' (otherwise $(u_1 : z, z', v_3)$ would be a claw). Analogously, v_5 is adjacent either to z or to z' (otherwise $(u_2 : z, z', v_5)$ would be a claw). Moreover, z is not adjacent to both v_3 and v_5 (otherwise $(z : x, v_3, v_5)$ would be a claw). A similar argument shows that z' is not adjacent to both v_3 and v_5. Hence, without loss of generality, we can assume $zv_3 \in E$ and $zv_5 \in E$.

Let $\bar{x}$ be a node in $X \cap \bar{T}$. Observe that $N(\bar{x}) \cap R' = \{u_1, u_2\}$, in particular $\bar{x}$ is non-adjacent to v_3 and v_5 so $z \neq \bar{x} \neq z'$. If $z\bar{x} \notin E$ we have $zv_3 \in E$ (otherwise $(u_1 : \bar{x}, v_3, z)$ would be a claw) and $zv_5 \in E$ (otherwise $(u_2 : \bar{x}, v_5, z)$ would be a claw). But then $(z : x, v_3, v_5)$ is a claw, a contradiction. It follows $z\bar{x} \in E$ and, by a similar argument, $z'\bar{x} \in E$.

Let q be a node in $N(\bar{x}) \cap N^2[H]$. We have that either zq or $z'q$ belongs to E (otherwise $(\bar{x} : q, z, z')$ would be a claw). But if $zq \in E$ then $(z : u_2, v_3, q)$ is a claw and if $z'q \in E$ then $(z' : u_1, v_5, q)$ is a claw. In both cases we have a contradiction.

We have thus proved that X is a clique. Since each node which does not belong to X is non-adjacent to either x or u_1 or u_2 it is also maximal. An analogous argument shows that Y is a maximal clique. *End of Claim (2.ii).*

Let $V_1 = N[H] \setminus \bar{T}$, $V_2 = V \setminus V_1$ and let $X_i = V_i \cap X$ and $Y_i = V_i \cap Y$ for $i = 1, 2$. If $\bar{T}$ is non-empty then either X_2 or Y_2 (or both) are non-empty.

Claim (2.iii). Let $u \in V_1$ and $v \in V_2$ be adjacent nodes. Then either $u \in X_1$ and $v \in X_2$ or $u \in Y_1$ and $v \in Y_2$.

Proof. Observe first that v belongs to $\bar{T}$. In fact, if $v \notin \bar{T}$ we have $v \notin N[H]$ and hence $u \notin H$. Since $u \in N(H)$, by claw freeness $|N(u) \cap H| = 2$, contradicting the assumption that $u \notin \bar{T}$. By Claim *(2.ii)* we have $T \subseteq X \cup Y$ and, by definition of (V_1, V_2), we have $\bar{T} \subseteq X_2 \cup Y_2$. Since v belongs to $\bar{T}$, it is adjacent to a node $t \in N^2(H)$. Assume, without loss of generality, that v belongs to Y_2 and hence that $N(v) \cap H = \{v_1, v_2\}$. Suppose $u \notin Y$, it follows that $u \notin N[y] \cap N[v_1] \cap N[v_2]$ and hence $u \notin \{y, v_1, v_2\}$. Moreover, u is adjacent to both v_1 and v_2 (otherwise either $(v : u, t, v_1)$ or $(v : u, t, v_2)$ would be a claw) and hence it is not adjacent to y. But u is not adjacent to both v_3 and v_5 (otherwise $(u : v, v_3, v_5)$ would be a claw) and hence either $(v_1 : u, v_5, y)$ or $(v_2 : u, v_3, y)$ is a claw in G, a contradiction. It follows that $u \in Y \cap V_1 = Y_1$ as claimed. *End of Claim (2.iii).*

Claim (2.iv). The cliques X and Y are both soft and there exists nodes $z, q \in V(M)$ such that $X \cap V(M) = \{z\}$ and $Y \cap V(M) = \{q\}$. Moreover, $X_2 = \{z\}$, $Y_2 = \{q\}$ and both cliques $X \setminus \{z\}$ and $Y \setminus \{q\}$ are rigid.

Proof. We claim that each edge uv with $u \in X_1$ and $v \in X_2$ is not rigid in G. Suppose the contrary and let $t, \bar{t}$ be non-adjacent nodes universal to $\{u, v\}$. We can assume $t \in N(X)$ and $\bar{t} \in X$. If t belongs to V_1 we have, by Claim *(2.iii)*, $t \in X_1$. If, conversely, t belongs to V_2 we have $t \in X_2$. In both cases $t \in X$, contradicting the assumption that $t \in N(X)$. It follows that X is a soft clique. Since, by hypothesis, every maximal clique in $G - V(M)$ is rigid, we have that X contains a node $z \in V(M)$. Let $\bar{z}$ be the node matched to z by M. By Claim *(2.i)*, z belongs to T. If $\bar{z}$ belonged to $N(H)$ it should belong, by the same claim, to T, contradicting the hypothesis that $z\bar{z} \in M$ and is strongly bisimplicial. It follows that $\bar{z} \notin N(H)$ and hence that $z \in \bar{T}$ and $\bar{z} \in N^2(H)$. Moreover, hypothesis, we have that z is not adjacent to a node $z' \in V(M) \setminus \{\bar{z}\}$ only if both nodes belong to an M-clique. Since C is not an M-clique, it follows that $X \cap V(M) = \{z\}$ and that the clique $X \setminus \{z\}$, which is maximal in $G - V(M)$, is rigid. Since each edge uv with $u \in X_1$ and $v \in X_2$ is not rigid we have that $X \setminus \{z\} = X_1$ and $X_2 = \{z\}$. Analogously, Y is a soft clique, contains a node $q \in V(M)$ and has the property that $Y \setminus \{q\}$ is rigid and $Y_2 = \{q\}$. *End of Claim (2.iv).*

Claim (2.v). $T = \bar{T} = \{q, z\}$.

Proof. We only prove that $T \cap X = \{z\}$, the proof that $T \cap Y = \{q\}$ is analogous. Let u be a node in $(T \cap X) \setminus \{z\}$ and let $\bar{z}$ be the node matched to z by M. The node u is different from z since z belongs to $\bar{T}$. By Claim *(2.iv)*, the clique $X \setminus \{z\}$ is rigid and hence at least one edge uv with $v \in X \setminus T$ is rigid (both $T \supseteq \{u, z\}$ and $X \setminus T$ are non-empty). Since uv is rigid, there exist two non-adjacent nodes nodes q and $\bar{q}$ universal to $\{u, v\}$. Since both u and v are adjacent to z and $z\bar{z}$ is strongly bisimplicial, we have that $q, \bar{q} \neq \bar{z}$. Moreover, since $N[z] \setminus \bar{z}$ is a clique, we have that either q or $\bar{q}$ does not belong to $N[z]$.

Suppose, without loss of generality, that $q \notin N[z]$ and hence that $q \in N(X \setminus \{z\})$. Since $v \in X \setminus T$, we have that v is adjacent to $\{z, u_1, u_2\}$ and is either adjacent to three consecutive nodes of R' (including u_1 and u_2) or belongs to $U_3 \cup U_4$. In the first case, by claw-freeness, v is either adjacent to v_3 or v_5 but not both (otherwise $(v : z, v_3, v_5)$ would be a claw). In the second case we have two subcases: either (1) $v \in U_3$, $vv_3 \in E$ if (otherwise $(v : z, v_3, q)$ would be a claw) and $vv_5 \notin E$ (otherwise $(v : u, v_3, v_5)$ would be a claw); or (2) $v \in U_4$, $vv_5 \in E$ (otherwise $(v : z, v_5, q)$ would be a claw and $vv_3 \notin E$ (otherwise $(v : u, v_3, v_5)$ would be a claw).

The symmetry of the last two subcases allows us to assume, without loss of generality, that $vv_3 \in E$ and $vv_5 \notin E$. Since $qz \notin E$ and $zv_3 \notin E$ we have that $qv_3 \in E$ (otherwise $(v : z, v_3, q)$ would be a claw). It follows that $qv_5 \notin E$ (otherwise $(q : u, v_3, v_5)$ would be a claw) and $qv_1 \notin E$ (otherwise $(q : u, v_3, v_1)$ would be a claw).

If $qv_0 \in E$ we have, by claw-freeness, that q must be adjacent to three consecutive nodes of R. Since q is not adjacent to v_1 and v_5, it must be adjacent to v_2, v_3 and v_4. But then $(q : u, v_2, v_4)$ is a claw $(N(u) \cap R = \emptyset)$, a contradiction. It follows that $qv_0 \notin E$. By claw-freeness, q must be adjacent to at least two consecutive nodes of R'. Since $qv_3 \in E$ and $qv_0 \notin E$ we have that $qu_1 \in E$. Moreover, we have that $qv_4 \in E$ (otherwise $(u_1 : q, z, v_4)$ would be a claw) and $qu_2 \in E$ (otherwise $(v_4 : q, u_2, v_0)$ would be a claw). But then $(u_2 : q, z, v_5)$ is a claw, a contradiction. *End of Claim (2.v).*

By Claim *(2.iv)* $X_2 = \{z\}$ and $Y_2 = \{q\}$ $(z \neq q)$. Moreover, by Claim *(2.v)*, we have that $T = \bar{T} = \{q, z\}$. It follows that $C = V_1 \cup \bar{T} = V_1 \cup X_2 \cup Y_2 = V_1 \cup \{z, q\}$

and, consequently, that $|C \cap V(M)| \leq 2$ and $C \setminus V(M) = V_1 = N[H] \setminus \bar{T} \subseteq N[R]$. The theorem follows. *End of Case (2).* □

The above results suggest a procedure for obtaining a quasi-line graph (and corresponding weighting vector) from a claw-free graph $G(V, E)$ (with $\alpha(G) \geq 4$) with weighting vector w. In fact, we can first list all the maximal soft cliques of G and lift them, obtaining a claw-free graph $G'(V', E')$ together with a canonical matching M' and a corresponding weighting vector w'. The graph G' and the matching M' have the property that every maximal clique of $G' - V(M')$ is rigid and two nodes $u, v \in V(M')$ are adjacent if and only if they are either matched by M' or both belong to an M'-clique. Then we can consider each connected component C of $G' - V(M')$ and, if $\alpha(C \setminus V(M')) \leq 3$ and $|V(M') \cap C| \leq 2$, remove C and the connecting edges of M' (together with their end-nodes) from G'.

Let H be the graph obtained in this way and let w_H be the corresponding weighting vector. By Theorem 65 each non-regular node of G' is confined in a component C of $G' - V(M')$ such that $\alpha(C \setminus V(M')) \leq 3$ and $|V(M') \cap C| \leq 2$. Hence H is quasi-line. Moreover the above results imply that H and w_H can be obtained in $\mathcal{O}(|V|^2)$ time. In the following sections we concentrate on (connected) quasi-line graphs and show how to transform them into graphs with an even simpler structure. As a consequence we will show that the the MWSS problem in a claw-free graph $G(V, E)$ can be solved in $\mathcal{O}(|V|^2 \log(|V|))$ time.

7 Lifting free components and S-liftable cliques: from quasi-line to basic quasi-line

Theorem 71 *Let $G(V, E)$ be a quasi-line graph and S a canonical stable set of G. A family $\mathcal{L}$ of weakly normal cliques containing all the normal cliques of G can be constructed in $\mathcal{O}(|V|^2)$ time.*

Proof. By Theorem 53 the normal cliques of G belong to $\mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{F}$, where $\mathcal{F}$ is the family of the free components of G with respect to S and $\mathcal{C}$ is any S-cover of G. We first let $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{F}$. By Theorem 52 $\mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{F}$ can be constructed in $\mathcal{O}(|V|^2)$ time; moreover observe that $\mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{F}$ contains $\mathcal{O}(|V|)$ elements. Then, in overall time $\mathcal{O}(|V|^2)$, we construct the list $\{\mathcal{L}_u : u \in V\}$, where $\mathcal{L}_u$ is the family of cliques in $\mathcal{L}$ containing the node u and the list $\{\mathcal{L}_{st} : s, t \in S\}$, where $\mathcal{L}_{st}$ is the family of free components in $\mathcal{L}$ intersecting only the two similarity classes $F(s)$ and $F(t)$. Moreover, again in overall time $\mathcal{O}(|V|^2)$, we record for each $v \in V$ and each free component Q intersecting two similarity classes ($Q \in \mathcal{L}_{st}$) whether v is universal, null or neither to $Q_i = Q \cap F(i)$ ($i = s, t$).

Observe now that each free component in $\mathcal{L}$ intersecting three or more free similarity classes is normal and, by Corollary 31, weakly normal. It follows that the free components in $\mathcal{L}$ which are not weakly normal (and can be removed) intersect exactly two similarity classes. The following claim characterizes the weakly normal free components intersecting two free similarity classes (equivalently, belonging to some wing).

Claim (i). A free component $Q \in \mathcal{L}_{st}$ is not weakly normal if and only if there exists a bound node $x \in W(s, t)$ adjacent to some node $z \in Q_s$ and to some node $v \in Q_t$

and a node $y \in (N(s) \cup N(t)) \setminus Q$ *adjacent either to* z *or to* v *and non-adjacent to* x.

Proof. If there exist a bound node $x \in W(s,t)$ and a node $y \in (N(s) \cup N(t)) \setminus Q$ both adjacent to a node $z \in Q$ with $xy \notin E$ then Q is trivially not weakly normal.

On the other hand, if Q is not weakly normal then there exist two nodes x and y not in Q having a common neighbor z in Q. Without loss of generality, assume $z \in Q_s$. Moreover, if both x and y are non-adjacent to some node $v \in Q_t$, then $(z : v, x, y)$ is a claw, a contradiction. Hence, without loss of generality, we can assume that x is adjacent to v. If x is free then either xz or xv is an edge in the free dissimilarity graph and x belongs to Q, a contradiction. It follows that x is bound and, since it is adjacent to $z \in F(s)$ and $v \in F(t)$, by claw-freeness it must be adjacent to both s and t and so belongs to $W(s,t)$. Now, if y is non-adjacent to v then it must be adjacent to s (otherwise $(z : s, y, v)$ would be a claw in G). On the other hand, if y is adjacent to v the same argument used for x shows that y is a bound node in $W(s,t)$. In both cases y belongs to $(N(s) \cup N(t)) \setminus Q$ and the claim follows.
End of Claim (i).

Claim (ii). If $|\mathcal{L}_{st}| \geq 2$ *then a free component* $Q \in \mathcal{L}_{st}$ *is not weakly normal if and only if there exists a bound node* $x \in W(s,t)$ *adjacent to both* Q_s *and* Q_t.

Proof. Assume first that Q is not weakly normal. By Claim *(i)* there exists a bound node $x \in W(s,t)$ adjacent to some node $z \in Q_s$ and to some node $v \in Q_t$, so the claim follows.

Suppose now that there exists a bound node $x \in W(s,t)$ adjacent to a node $z \in Q_s$ and a node $v \in Q_t$. Let $Q' \neq Q$ be another clique of $\mathcal{L}_{st}$ and let $y \in Q'$ be a node non-adjacent to x. Such a node exists because, otherwise, Q' would not be maximal. Without loss of generality, assume $y \in Q'_s$. Since y and z belong to $F(s)$ we have that $z \in Q$ is a common neighbor of $x, y \in N(Q)$, hence Q is not weakly normal and the claim follows.
End of Claim (ii).

Remove now from $\mathcal{L}$ all the free components $Q \in \mathcal{L}_{st}$ with $|\mathcal{L}_{st}| \geq 2$ and such that there exists a bound node $x \in W(s,t)$ adjacent to both Q_s and Q_t. By Claim *(ii)*, we have that $\mathcal{L}$ still contains all the weakly normal cliques in $\mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{F}$. Observe that the above eliminations can be carried out in overall time $\mathcal{O}(|V|^2)$. Now, let $NSize$ be a matrix such that, for each node $u \in V$ and each clique $Q \in \mathcal{L}$, $NSize[u, Q]$ is the number of nodes in $N(u) \cap Q$.

Claim (iii). The matrix $NSize[\cdot, \cdot]$ *can be computed in* $\mathcal{O}(|V|^2)$ *time.*

Proof. Let initialize $NSize[u, Q] := 0$ for each node $u \in V$ and each clique in $\mathcal{L}_u$ (at most 4 by Theorem 51). Then, for each edge $uv \in E$, each clique $Q^u \in \mathcal{L}_u$ and each clique $Q^v \in \mathcal{L}_v$ (there are at most 8 such cliques), let $NSize[u, Q^v] := NSize[u, Q^v]+1$ and $NSize[v, Q^u] := NSize[v, Q^u]+1$. Evidently the computation produces the desired matrix and can be carried out in overall time $\mathcal{O}(|V|^2)$.
End of Claim (iii).

Claim (iv). If Q *belongs to* $\mathcal{L}$ *and* $u, v \in N(Q)$ *are non-adjacent then* u *and* v *have a common neighbor in* Q *if and only if* $NSize[u, Q] + NSize[v, Q] > |Q|$.

Proof. By claw-freeness two non-adjacent nodes $u, v \in N(Q)$ with a common neighbor in Q have the property that $N(\{u, v\}) \supseteq Q$ and hence that $NSize[u, Q] + NSize[v, Q] > |Q|$. The converse is obvious.
End of Claim (iv).

Now, to complete the construction we have to remove the remaining cliques in $\mathcal{L}$ which are not weakly normal. In particular, since we have removed from $\mathcal{L}$ all the free components in $\mathcal{L}_{st}$ with $|\mathcal{L}_{st}| \geq 2$ for each wing $W(s, t)$, each free component in $\mathcal{L}$ which is not weakly normal is contained in some wing $W(s, t)$ satisfying $|\mathcal{L}_{st}| = 1$. By Claim *(i)* one such clique Q is not weakly normal if and only if there exists a bound node $x \in W(s, t)$ and a non-adjacent node $y \in (N(s) \cup N(t)) \setminus Q$ with a common neighbor in Q. Hence, to remove such cliques we do the following. For each bound node x contained in some wing $W(s, t)$ we check whether $|\mathcal{L}_{st}| = 1$. If this is the case, letting $\mathcal{L}_{st} = \{Q\}$, we check whether $NSize[x, Q] + NSize[y, Q] > |Q|$ for some node $y \in (N(s) \cup N(t)) \setminus Q$ which is non-adjacent to x. By Claim *(iv)*, the non-adjacent nodes $x, y \in N(Q)$ have a common neighbor in Q if and only if $NSize[x, Q] + NSize[y, Q] > |Q|$, so by such procedure we can find (and remove form $\mathcal{L}$) all the remaining free components which are not weakly normal. Moreover, it is easy to observe that the above computations can be carried out in overall time $\mathcal{O}(|V|^2)$.

Finally, to remove the cliques in $\mathcal{L} \cap \mathcal{C}$ which are not weakly normal we check, for each pair of non-adjacent nodes $x, y \in V$, whether they have a common neighbor in some clique $Q \in \mathcal{C}$ not containing x and y and, in such a case, remove Q from $\mathcal{L}$. To assess the complexity of this operation suppose first that both x and y are bound and belong, respectively, to the possibly coincident wings $W(s, t)$ and $W(u, v)$. Assume that there exists a clique $Q \in \mathcal{C}$ containing a common neighbor q of x and y. Let z be the node in $Q \cap S$ and observe that z is in $\{s, t, u, v\}$, otherwise $(q : x, y, z)$ would be a claw in G. It follows that Q belongs to one of the pairs $(C_s, \overline{C}_s)$, $(C_t, \overline{C}_t)$, $(C_u, \overline{C}_u)$, $(C_v, \overline{C}_v)$ and hence for each pair x, y of non-adjacent bound nodes we have to test at most eight cliques. Similar arguments show that if x and/or y is free then we have to test less than eight cliques. Moreover, by Claim *(iii)*, we can verify that the non-adjacent nodes x, y have a common neighbor in Q by checking whether $NSize[x, Q] + NSize[y, Q] > |Q|$. This implies that the overall check can be performed in $\mathcal{O}(|V|^2)$ time. □

Theorem 72 *Let $G(V, E)$ be a quasi-line graph, S a canonical stable set of G, Q a weakly normal clique in G and $x, y \in Q$ the base of a Q-paw. Then either*

(a) *x and y belong to a common wing $W(q, s)$ and are similar; or*
(b) *x and y belong to a common wing $W(q, s)$, one of them is bound, the other is free and $F(q) \setminus Q$ is empty; or*
(c) *$\{x, y\} = \{u, v\}$ with $u \in S$, v bound in $W(u, r)$ with $N(r) \supseteq N(u) \setminus Q$; or*
(d) *$\{x, y\} = \{u, v\}$ with $u \in S$, v free in $W(u, r)$ with $W(u, r) \supseteq N(u) \setminus Q$.*

Proof. Let $(x, y : z, h)$ be the Q-paw whose base is $\{x, y\}$ and z belongs to $N(Q)$. By Theorem 53 either Q belongs to $\mathcal{F}$ or belongs to a pair $(Q, \overline{Q})$ of maximal cliques covering $N[s]$, with $s \in Q \cap S$.

Assume first $Q \in \mathcal{F}$ so that x and y are free nodes. We have that $S \cap N(Q)$ contains at least two nodes, since otherwise the unique stable node in $N(Q)$ would be universal to Q, contradicting its maximality. If x and y are adjacent to the same stable node q then they belong to the wing $W(q,s)$, with $s \in S \cap N(Q) \setminus \{q\}$ and are similar. It follows that *(a)* applies and we are done. Hence, by contradiction, assume $S(x) \neq S(y)$. Let $s = S(x)$ and $t = S(y)$. Since Q is weakly normal we have $tz \in E$ and $sz \in E$. Moreover, $ht \in E$ (otherwise $(z : h, t, x)$ would be a claw) and $hs \in E$ (otherwise $(z : h, s, y)$ would be a claw). But then $(z : h, s, x, y, t)$ is a 5-wheel, a contradiction.

Assume now that Q contains a stable node q and let $\overline{Q}$ be a maximal clique such that $N[q] \subseteq Q \cup \overline{Q}$. Hence, we let $Q \equiv C_q$ and $\overline{Q} \equiv \overline{C}_q$.

Suppose first that $q \notin \{x, y\}$. If x, y belong to a common wing and are similar then *(a)* is satisfied and we are done. If x, y belong to a common wing $W(q,s)$ and are not similar then one of them, say x, is bound and the other is free. If $F(q) \setminus C_q$ is empty, then *(b)* is satisfied and we are done. If, conversely, $F(q) \setminus C_q \neq \emptyset$, let p be a free node in $\overline{C}_q \setminus \{q\}$. Since p belongs to $F(q)$ and S is canonical, p is adjacent to y. We have that $xp \notin E$, otherwise s and p would be non-adjacent nodes with a common neighbor $x \in C_q$ and would contradict the hypothesis that C_q is weakly normal. It follows that $p \neq z$ (since z is adjacent to x) and that $zp \in E$, otherwise the non-adjacent nodes z and p and their common neighbor $y \in C_q$ would contradict the hypothesis that C_q is weakly normal. Analogously, $zs \in E$, otherwise the non-adjacent nodes z and s and their common neighbor $x \in C_q$ would contradict the hypothesis that C_q is weakly normal. Finally, $hs \in E$ (otherwise $(z : h, s, y)$ would be a claw) and $hp \in E$ (otherwise $(z : h, p, x)$ would be a claw). But then $(z : h, p, y, x, s)$ is a 5-wheel, a contradiction.

If x and y do not belong to a common wing, since $N(x) \setminus C_q$ and $N(y) \setminus C_q$ are both non-empty (they contain z) we have that x and y belong to different wings $W(q,s)$ and $W(q,t)$, respectively, with $q \neq s, t$. By symmetry, we have to consider three cases: *(i)* $x \in N(s)$ and $y \in N(t)$, *(ii)* $x \in N(s)$ and $y \notin N(t)$, *(iii)* $x \notin N(s)$ and $y \notin N(t)$.

Case (i). Since C_q is weakly normal we have that $sz \in E$ and $tz \in E$ and, consequently, that $hs \in E$ (otherwise $(z : y, s, h)$ would be a claw) and $ht \in E$ (otherwise $(z : x, t, h)$ would be a claw). Observe that $sy \notin E$ and $tx \notin E$ by claw-freeness and hence $(z : h, s, x, y, t)$ is a 5-wheel in G, a contradiction.

Case (ii). In this case y is a free node in C_q. Since $y \notin I(q)$ it belongs to $O(q) \cap C_q$ and hence there exists a free node $\overline{x}$ adjacent to y and t. Observe that $x\overline{x} \notin E$ (otherwise $(x : q, s, \overline{x})$ would be a claw). Since C_q is weakly normal, we have that $sz \in E$ and $\overline{x}z \in E$. Moreover, since y is free and adjacent to q, we have $sy \notin E$ and hence $sh \in E$, otherwise $(z : s, y, h)$ would be a claw in G. Finally, $h\overline{x} \in E$ (otherwise $(z : x, \overline{x}, h)$ would be a claw in G) and $s\overline{x} \notin E$ (since $\overline{x}$ is free and adjacent to $t \neq s$). But then $(z : h, s, x, y, \overline{x})$ is a 5-wheel in G, a contradiction.

Case (iii). In this case both x and y are free nodes. It follows that both x and y belong to $O(q) \cap C_q$ and that there exist two free nodes $\overline{y} \in N(x) \cap N(s)$ and $\overline{x} \in N(y) \cap N(t)$. Observe that $y\overline{y} \notin E$ (since y does not belong to the wing $W(q,s)$). If either $x\overline{x} \in E$ or $\overline{xy} \in E$ then the nodes $x, y, \overline{x}, \overline{y}$ would belong to the same connected component H of the free dissimilarity graph G_F. But H intersects the free similarity classes of s, q and t and hence, by Theorem 21, the nodes $x, y, \overline{x}, \overline{y}$ induce a clique, contradicting the fact that $y\overline{y} \notin E$. It follows that $x\overline{x} \notin E$ and $\overline{xy} \notin E$. Since C_q is weakly normal we have that $\overline{x}z \in E$ and $\overline{y}z \in E$. Moreover, $\overline{x}h \in E$ (otherwise $(z : h, x, \overline{x})$ would be a claw) and $\overline{y}h \in E$ (otherwise $(z : h, y, \overline{y})$ would be a claw). But then $(z : h, \overline{y}, x, y, \overline{x})$ is a 5-wheel in G, a contradiction.

Consider now the case $q \in \{x, y\}$ and, without loss of generality, let $q \equiv x$. Since $y \notin I(x)$ (it is adjacent to $z \notin Q$) we have that y belongs to some wing $W(x, r)$. Suppose first that y is bound. If $N(r) \supseteq N(x) \setminus Q$ *(c)* applies and we are done. Otherwise, let p be a node in $N(x) \setminus Q$ which does not belong to $N(r)$. Since Q is weakly normal, we have $zr \in E$ and $yp \notin E$ (otherwise p and r would be non-adjacent nodes in $N(Q)$ with the common neighbor $y \in Q$). It follows that $z \neq p$, $zp \in E$ (since Q is weakly normal) and $hp \in E$ (otherwise $(z : h, p, y)$ would be a claw). Moreover, we have that $hr \in E$ (otherwise $(z : h, r, x)$ would be a claw). But then $(z : h, r, y, x, p)$ is a 5-wheel in G, a contradiction.

Suppose now that y is free. If $W(x, r) \supseteq N(x) \setminus Q$ *(d)* applies and we are done. Otherwise, let p be a node in $N(x) \setminus Q$ which does not belong to $W(x, r)$. Since $y \in W(x, r)$, the node y is adjacent to a node $\overline{y} \in F(r)$. If $\overline{y}p \in E$ then p is either a bound node adjacent to r or a free node in $O(x)$. In both cases it would belong to $W(x, r)$, contradicting the assumption. It follows that $\overline{y}p \notin E$ and hence $yp \notin E$ for, otherwise, p and $\overline{y}$ would be non-adjacent nodes in $N(Q)$ with the common neighbor $y \in Q$ contradicting the hypothesis that Q is weakly normal. For the same reason $z\overline{y} \in E$ and, consequently, $h\overline{y} \in E$ (otherwise $(z : x, \overline{y}, h)$ would be a claw). Moreover, since $\overline{y}p \notin E$ and $z\overline{y} \in E$ we have $z \neq p$ and $zp \in E$ (since Q is weakly normal). Finally, $hp \in E$ (otherwise $(z : h, y, p)$ would be a claw). But then $(z : h, \overline{y}, y, x, p)$ is a 5-wheel in G, a contradiction. The theorem follows. ☐

Theorem 73 *Let $G(V, E)$ be a quasi-line graph and S a canonical stable set of G. Then a weakly normal free component Q of G is* liftable *with respect to the partition $\{N(q_i) \cap Q : q_i \in N(Q) \cap S\}$.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{K} = \{K_1, K_2, \ldots, K_p\}$, with $K_i = N(q_i) \cap Q$ $(i \in \{1, \ldots, p\}$. Since Q is weakly normal the theorem will follow by showing that also conditions *(ii)* and *(iii)* of Definition 44 are satisfied. Assume first that there exist an edge xy with $x \in K_i$, $y \in K_j$ $(i \neq j,\ K_i, K_j \in \mathcal{K})$ which is the base of a Q-paw $(x, y : z, h)$. Since x and y are both free nodes, by Theorem 72 x and y must satisfy Condition *(a)*. But this is impossible since $S(x) \neq S(y)$. It follows that condition *(ii)* is satisfied. Assume now that there exists a triangle $\{x, y, z\}$ with $x \in K_i$, $y \in K_j$, $z \in K_t$ $(i \neq j \neq t \neq i,\ K_i, K_j, K_t \in \mathcal{K})$ having a common neighbor $h \in N(Q)$. Since x, y and z are dissimilar, we have $h \notin \{q_i, q_j, q_k\}$; moreover, since Q is weakly normal, we have $hq_i \in E$ (otherwise h and q_i are non-adjacent nodes in $N(Q)$ having the common neighbor $x \in Q$). Analogously, we also have $hq_j \in E$ and $hq_t \in E$. But then $(h : q_i, q_j, q_t)$ is a claw in G, a contradiction. Hence condition *(iii)* is also satisfied and the theorem follows. ☐

Definition 71 *Let $G(V, E)$ be a quasi-line graph and S a canonical stable set in G. Let $M \subseteq E$ be an S-matching of G. A lifting $G^{(Q,\mathcal{K})}$ of G with respect to a weakly normal free component Q and partition $\mathcal{K}$ is said to be a* free component lifting *if and only if Q is not an M-clique and $\mathcal{K} = \{N(s_i) \cap Q : s_i \in N(Q) \cap S\}$.* ☐

Theorem 74 *Let $G(V, E)$ be a connected claw-free graph, let S be a canonical stable set of G and $M \subseteq E$ be an S-matching of G. Let $G^{(Q,\mathcal{K})}$ be a free component lifting of G with respect to Q and $\mathcal{K}$ and let $S^{(Q,\mathcal{K})}$ be the extension of S. Then any weakly normal free component of $G^{(Q,\mathcal{K})}$ with respect to $S^{(Q,\mathcal{K})}$ which is not the lifting clique is a weakly normal free component of G with respect to S while any* *weakly normal free component of G with respect to S which is not Q is a weakly normal free component of $G^{(Q,\mathcal{K})}$ with respect to $S^{(Q,\mathcal{K})}$.*

Proof. By Definition 71, Q is not an M-clique and $\mathcal{K} = \{N(s_i) \cap Q : s_i \in N(Q) \cap S\}$. Let Q' be a weakly normal free component in $G^{(Q,\mathcal{K})}$ with respect to $S^{(Q,\mathcal{K})}$ which is not the lifting clique. It is easy to see that Q' does not contain lifting nodes. Moreover, since by Definition 48 the nodes in $K_i = N(s_i) \cap Q$ are bound with respect to $S^{(Q,\mathcal{K})}$ in $G^{(Q,\mathcal{K})}$, Q' does not intersect the set Q. Observe that any edge added or removed by the lifting operation has the endpoints which are either lifting nodes or belong to Q. Consequently, any edge in $G^{(Q,\mathcal{K})}$ with one endpoint in Q' is also an edge in G. It follows that Q' is a maximal clique in G, contains only free nodes with respect to S and satisfies $N(Q') \cap S = N(Q') \cap S^{(Q,\mathcal{K})}$. Hence, Q' is a free component of G with respect to S and, by Theorem 41, is also weakly normal in G.

Assume now that Q' is a weakly normal free component in G with respect to S different from Q and, by contradiction, it is not a weakly normal free component in $G^{(Q,\mathcal{K})}$. Observe that Q and Q' have empty intersection and by the same argument used above Q' is not adjacent to any lifting node and is a free component in $G^{(Q,\mathcal{K})}$ with respect to $S^{(Q,\mathcal{K})}$. It follows that Q' is not weakly normal in $G^{(Q,\mathcal{K})}$ and hence there exists in $G^{(Q,\mathcal{K})}$ two non-adjacent nodes $x, y \notin Q'$ with a common neighbor $z \in Q'$. Observe that, since Q' is not adjacent to any lifting node, we have $x, y \in V$. Moreover, the edges xz and yz are not added by the lifting operation and, since Q' is weakly normal in G, x and y are adjacent in G. But then we have (without loss of generality) $x \in N(s_1) \cap Q$ and $y \in N(s_2) \cap Q$. However, since x and z (y and z) belong to different components of the free dissimilarity graph of G with respect to S, we have $x \sim z \sim y$ contradicting the fact that the nodes in K_1 are dissimilar from the nodes in K_2. The theorem follows. □

Definition 72 *Let $G(V, E)$ be a quasi-line graph, S a canonical stable set and Q a clique in G containing a stable node q. Then a wing $W(q, r)$ satisfying $W(q, r) \supseteq N(q) \setminus Q$ and containing two adjacent nodes $x \in Q \setminus \{q\}$ and $y \in N(q) \setminus Q$ is said to be a* polar wing *of Q and the stable node r a* polar node *of Q.* □

Theorem 75 *Let $G(V, E)$ be a quasi-line graph and S a canonical stable set. If Q is a weakly normal clique containing a stable node q then there exists at most one polar wing of Q.*

Proof. Assume by contradiction that there exist two polar wings $W(q, r)$ and $W(q, r')$ of Q. Since each bound node in $N(q) \setminus Q$ is contained in a single wing, we have that each node in $N(q) \setminus Q$ is free. Since $W(q, r)$ is a polar wing of Q, we have that there exist two adjacent nodes $z \in N(q) \setminus Q$ and $z' \in Q \cap W(q, r)$. Suppose that z' is a bound node and let t be the stable node in $S \setminus \{s\}$ adjacent to z'. But then z and t are non-adjacent nodes in $N(Q)$ with a common neighbor $z' \in Q$ contradicting the assumption that Q is weakly normal. It follows that z' is a free node in Q. But then $N(z') \supseteq N(q)$ contradicting the assumption that S is a canonical stable set. □

Definition 73 *Let $G(V, E)$ be a quasi-line graph, S a canonical stable set and $\mathcal{C}$ an S-cover of G. Let C_q be a clique in $\mathcal{C}$, let $W(q, r)$ be the polar wing of C_q (if it exists) and let $W(q, s_i)$ ($s_i \neq r$, $i = 1, \ldots, p$) be the non-polar wings intersecting C_q. Then the partition $\mathcal{K}$ of C_q defined as:*

(i) $\mathcal{K} = \{C_q(s_i) : i = 1, \dots, p\} \cup \{C_q(r) \cup \{q\} \cup I(q)\}$ *if* $F(q) \setminus C_q = \emptyset$*;*
(ii) $\mathcal{K} = \{C_q(s_i) : i = 1, \dots, p\} \cup \{(C_q \cap W^F(q, r)) \cup \{q\} \cup I(q), W^B(q, r) \cap C_q\}$ *if* $F(q) \setminus C_q \neq \emptyset$*;*

is said to be the S-partition *of* C_q*.*

Theorem 76 *Let* $G(V, E)$ *be a quasi-line graph,* S *a canonical stable set and* $\mathcal{C}$ *an* S*-cover of* G*. Let* $C_q \in \mathcal{C}$ *be a weakly normal clique not intersecting a normal free component. Then* C_q *is* liftable *with respect to the* S*-partition* $\mathcal{K}$*.*

Proof. Since C_q is weakly normal the theorem will follow by showing that also the second and third conditions of Definition 44 are satisfied. Let K_i be a set in the partition $\mathcal{K}$ of C_q. First, we claim that any edge xy with $x \in K_i$ and $y \in C_q \setminus K_i$ is not the base of a C_q-paw $(x, y : z, h)$. In fact, if $K_i = C_q(s_i)$ for $s_i \neq r$, $i = 1, \dots, p$, then conditions *(a)* and *(b)* of Theorem 72 are not satisfied since x and y do not belong to the same wing. Moreover, condition *(c)* of Theorem 72 is also not satisfied. In fact, otherwise, $y \equiv q$, each node in $N(q) \setminus C_q$ would be bound and would belong to the wing $W(q, s_i)$. Moreover, the node h would belong to $N(q) \setminus C_q$ and would be adjacent to x, implying that $W(q, s_i)$ is the polar wing of C_q and contradicting the assumption that $s_i \neq r$. Finally, condition *(d)* of Theorem 72 is also not satisfied since x is neither stable nor free.

Assume now that $K_i = C_q(r) \cup \{q\} \cup I(q)$. Conditions *(a)* and *(b)* of Theorem 72 are not satisfied since x and y do not belong to the same wing. Moreover, conditions *(c)* and *(d)* of Theorem 72 are also not satisfied. In fact, otherwise, $x \equiv q$ and each node in $N(q) \setminus C_q$ would belong to the wing $W(q, s_j)$ containing y ($s_j \neq r$). Moreover, the node h would belong to $N(q) \setminus C_q$ and would be adjacent to y, implying that $W(q, s_j)$ is the polar wing of C_q and contradicting the assumption that $s_j \neq r$.

Assume now that $K_i = C_q \cap W^B(q, r)$. In this case (case *(ii)*) $F(q) \setminus C_q \neq \emptyset$. If condition *(a)* of Theorem 72 were satisfied then x would be a bound node in $W(q, r)$ and y would be similar to x. But this is impossible, since y does not belong to $W^B(q, r)$. Moreover, conditions *(b)* and *(c)* of Theorem 72 are not satisfied either, since $F(q) \setminus C_q$ is not empty while condition *(d)* of Theorem 72 is not satisfied since x is neither stable nor free.

Finally, assume that $K_i = (C_q \cap W^F(q, r)) \cup \{q\} \cup I(q)$. In this case (again case *(ii)*) $F(q) \setminus C_q \neq \emptyset$. Condition *(a)* of Theorem 72 is not satisfied since either x and y do not belong to the same wing or they are not similar. Moreover, conditions *(b)* and *(c)* of Theorem 72 are not satisfied either, since $F(q) \setminus C_q$ is not empty while condition *(d)* of Theorem 72 is not satisfied since y does not belong to $W^F(q, r) \subset K_i$.

Hence, we have shown that the second condition of Definition 44 is satisfied. To complete the proof, we have to show that also the third condition is satisfied. Let $x \in K_i$, $y \in K_j$, $z \in K_t$ ($i \neq j \neq t \neq i$, $K_i, K_j, K_t \in \mathcal{K}$) be three nodes in C_q and assume, by contradiction, that they have a common neighbor h in $N(C_q)$. If q belongs to $K_i \cup K_j \cup K_t$ assume, without loss of generality, $q \in K_i$. In any case, y and z belong to different partial wings $C_q(s_j)$ and $C_q(s_t)$ (possibly $r \in \{s_j, s_t\}$), respectively. If y is a bound node, let $\bar{y} \equiv s_j$, otherwise let $\bar{y}$ be a free node in $N(y) \cap N(s_j)$. Analogously, let $\bar{z}$ be either s_t (if z is a bound node) or a free node in $N(z) \cap N(s_t)$. Observe that $\bar{y}$ and $\bar{z}$ are non-adjacent. In fact, this is clear if at least one of them is a stable node; if both $\bar{y}$ and $\bar{z}$ are free and adjacent then $y, z, \bar{y}, \bar{z}$ would belong to a free component intersecting at least three similarity classes which, by Theorem 21 would be a normal clique, contradicting the assumption that C_q does not intersect a normal free component. Moreover, $\bar{y}$ and $\bar{z}$ are non-adjacent to x. In fact, assume by contradiction $\bar{y}x \in E$ ($\bar{z}x \in E$). If $\bar{y}$ ($\bar{z}$) belongs to S then x and y (x and z) are a pair of similar bound nodes belonging to different sets of the partition $\mathcal{K}$. But it is easily seen that this is impossible. On the other hand, if $\bar{y}$ is a free node in $N(y) \cap N(s_j)$ ($\bar{z}$ is a free node in $N(z) \cap N(s_t)$) then, contrary to what we proved above, the second condition of Definition 44 is violated by the paw $(x, y : \bar{y}, s_j)$ ($(x, z : \bar{z}, s_t)$). Finally, since C_q is weakly normal, $\bar{y}$ and $\bar{z}$ are both adjacent to h. But then $(h : x, \bar{y}, \bar{z})$ is a claw in G, a contradiction. The theorem follows. □

Definition 74 *Let $G(V, E)$ be a quasi-line graph and S a canonical stable set in G. Let $M \subseteq E$ be a matching of G. The graph G is said to be* free-lifted *with respect to S and M if each edge in M is a strongly bisimplicial clique intersecting S, each free node in $V(M)$ belongs to some M-clique and each liftable free component of G is an M-clique.* □

Theorem 77 *Let $G(V, E)$ be a quasi-line graph, S a canonical stable set of G and $M \subseteq E$ an S-matching of G with the property that each free node in $V(M)$ belongs to some M-clique. By successively applying free component liftings one can produce, in $\mathcal{O}(|V|^2)$ time, a quasi-line graph $\bar{G}(\bar{V}, \bar{E})$ and the corresponding extensions $\bar{S}$ of S and $\bar{M}$ of M in $\bar{G}$ with the property that $\bar{M}$ is an $\bar{S}$-matching, $|\bar{V}| = \mathcal{O}(|V|)$ and $\bar{G}$ is free-lifted with respect to $\bar{S}$ and $\bar{M}$.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{L}$ be the list of weakly normal free components in G which are not M-cliques. By Theorem 71, the list $\mathcal{L}$ can be constructed in $\mathcal{O}(|V|^2)$ time. Moreover, by Theorem 73, each free component $Q \in \mathcal{L}$ is liftable. Observe that the lifting of Q creates a new stable set S', a new S'-matching $M' \supset M$ and a new M'-clique Q' of free nodes, while the nodes in Q become bound, so the property that each free node in $V(M')$ belongs to some M'-clique is preserved. Moreover, by Theorem 74, any other weakly normal free component in $\mathcal{L}$ is a weakly normal free component of G' and any weakly normal free component of G' with respect to S' which is not an M'-clique belongs to $\mathcal{L}$. Let $\bar{G}(\bar{V}, \bar{E})$ be the graph obtained from G by lifting, one after the other, the free components in $\mathcal{L}$ and let $\bar{S}$ and $\bar{M}$ be the corresponding extensions of S and M, respectively, in $\bar{G}$. Observe that $\bar{G}$ is free-lifted with respect to $\bar{S}$ and $\bar{M}$. At each iteration we select a clique Q, partition Q in $p = \mathcal{O}(|Q|)$ similarity classes $(Q_1, \ldots, Q_p)$, remove the edges in each cut (Q_i, Q_j) $(i \neq j)$, add $2p$ new nodes and $p(p-1)/2 + p + |Q|$ edges as in Definition 41. Hence, the time complexity of the iteration is $\mathcal{O}(|Q|^2)$. It follows that the overall complexity of the procedure is $\mathcal{O}(|V|^2)$ as claimed. Finally, observe that, by construction, each edge $q\bar{q}$ in $\bar{M} \setminus M$ is adjacent to some node $v \in V$ (namely, $qv \in \bar{E}$, q belongs to $\bar{S}$ and v was a free node in some liftable free component in $\mathcal{L}$) and v is not adjacent to any other edge in $\bar{M} \setminus M$. It follows that $|\bar{M} \setminus M| \leq |V|$ and so $|\bar{V}| = \mathcal{O}(|V|)$. The theorem follows. □

Observe that $\bar{V} = V \cup V(\bar{M})$. Moreover, let $\bar{\mathcal{C}}$ be an $\bar{S}$-cover of $\bar{G}$ and let $\mathcal{T}$ be the list of cliques in $\bar{\mathcal{C}}$ which are not $\bar{M}$-cliques. By Theorem 71 $\mathcal{T}$ can be constructed in $\mathcal{O}(|\bar{V}|) = \mathcal{O}(|V|)$ time.

Definition 75 *Let $G(V, E)$ be a quasi-line graph, S a canonical stable set, $\mathcal{C}$ an S-cover of G and $M \subseteq E$ a matching of G. Let $C_q \in \mathcal{C}$ be a weakly normal clique not intersecting a normal free component. If at least two sets in the S-partition $\mathcal{K}$ of C_q are not contained in $V(M)$ or $|\mathcal{K}| \geq 3$ then C_q is said to be S-*liftable *with respect to $\mathcal{K}$ ($G^{(C_s,\mathcal{K})}$ is said to be an S-*lifting*).*

In the following two theorems we describe sufficient conditions for a clique in the S-cover to be S-liftable.

Theorem 78 *Let $G(V, E)$ be a quasi-line graph, S a canonical stable set in G and $M \subseteq E$ a matching of G. Assume that G is free-lifted with respect to S and M. Let s be a node in S and let $C_s, \overline{C}_s$ be any pair of maximal cliques covering $N[s]$. If C_s is a weakly normal clique and there exists two non-polar wings $W(s, t_1)$ and $W(s, t_2)$ intersecting C_s then C_s is S-liftable.*

Proof. Since G is free-lifted, C_s does not intersect a normal free component for, otherwise, C_s would be an M-clique of free nodes, a contradiction. Moreover, since neither $W(s, t_1)$ nor $W(s, t_2)$ is the polar wing $W(s, r)$ of C_s we have that $\mathcal{K}$ contains the sets $C_s(t_1)$, $C_s(t_2)$ and either $\{C_s(r) \cup \{s\} \cup I(s)\}$ (case *(i)* of Definition 73) or $\{(C_s \cap W^F(s, r)) \cup \{s\} \cup I(s)$ (case *(ii)* of Definition 73). It follows that $|\mathcal{K}| \geq 3$ and so C_s is S-liftable. The theorem follows. □

Theorem 79 *Let $G(V, E)$ be a quasi-line graph, S a canonical stable set in G and $M \subseteq E$ a matching of G. Assume that G is free-lifted with respect to S and M. Let $s \in S \setminus V(M)$ be a node with $k_s \geq 3$ and let $C_s, \overline{C}_s$ be any pair of maximal cliques covering $N[s]$. Then either C_s or $\overline{C}_s$ is normal and S-liftable.*

Proof. Let $W(s, t_i)$ ($i = 1, \ldots, p$, $p \geq 3$) be the wings intersecting $N(s)$. Without loss of generality, we can assume that two of them, say $W(s, t_1)$ and $W(s, t_2)$, intersect C_s.

Claim (i). For each pair $W(s, t_i)$, $W(s, t_j)$ ($i \neq j$) intersecting C_s and nodes $x, y \in N(C_s) \setminus \overline{C}_s$ with $x \in \{t_i\} \cup W(s, t_i)$ and $y \in \{t_j\} \cup W(s, t_j)$ we have that x and y are C_s-distant.

Proof. Since $x, y \in N(C_s) \setminus \overline{C}_s$ we have that x and y are not bound. If either $x = t_i$ or $y = t_j$ then x and y are not adjacent and have no common neighbor in C_s, so the claim easily follows. If, conversely, both x and y are free, let $\bar{x}$ and $\bar{y}$ (possibly coincident), be free nodes in C_s adjacent to x and y, respectively. If x and y are adjacent we have that $x, y, \bar{x}, \bar{y}$ belong to the similarity classes of nodes s, t_i and t_j. But then, by Theorem 21, they belong to a free component Q which is normal since it contains the net $(\bar{x}, x, y : s, t_i, t_j)$. Moreover, since G is quasi-line, by Corollary 31 Q is weakly normal and, by Theorem 73, is liftable. Since G is free-lifted with respect to S and M we have that Q is contained in $V(M)$ and $N[\bar{x}]$ is contained in $V(M)$. But this contradicts the assumption that $\bar{x}$ belongs to the clique C_s containing the node $s \in V \setminus V(M)$. Hence x and y are not adjacent and do not have a common neighbor $z \in C_s$ (otherwise $(z : x, y, s)$ is a claw). The claim follows.
End of Claim (i).

Let $x, y \in N(C_s) \setminus \overline{C}_s$ with $x \in \{t_1\} \cup W(s, t_1)$ and $y \in \{t_2\} \cup W(s, t_2)$. By Claim *(i)*, x and y are C_s-distant. Observe that if a node $v \in \overline{C}_s \setminus C_s$ is adjacent to x (y) then it belongs to $W(s, t_1)$ ($W(s, t_2)$). Now, if there exists a node $z \in \overline{C}_s \setminus C_s$ which is non-adjacent to both x and y then, by Theorem 31, C_s is normal. If, conversely, every node in $\overline{C}_s \setminus C_s$ is either adjacent to x or to y then $\overline{C}_s \setminus C_s \subseteq W(s, t_1) \cup W(s, t_2)$. Since $p \geq 3$ there exists a third wing, say $W(s, t_3)$. Since G is free-lifted, by Theorem 22 each node in $N(s)$ belongs to at most one wing and hence $W(s, t_3)$ does not intersects $\overline{C}_s \setminus C_s$ and, consequently, intersects C_s. But then there exists a node $z \in N(C_s) \setminus \overline{C}_s$ with $z \in \{t_3\} \cup W(s, t_3)$ and, by Claim *(i)*, x, y and z are mutually C_s-distant and hence C_s is normal.

To complete the proof of the theorem we now show that C_s is S-liftable. Since C_s is normal, it is weakly normal. Moreover, since G is free-lifted C_s does not intersect a normal free component for, otherwise, C_s would be an M-clique of free nodes, a contradiction. Now, if neither $W(s, t_1)$ nor $W(s, t_2)$ is the polar wing $W(s, r)$ of C_s then, by Theorem 78, C_s is S-liftable. If, on the other hand, $W(s, t_1)$ or $W(s, t_2)$ is the polar wing $W(s, r)$ of C_s (unique by Theorem 75) then there exists a third wing (say $W(s, t_3)$) which is non-polar and intersects C_s. Hence, the above argument can be repeated by interchanging $W(s, r)$ and $W(s, t_3)$ and the theorem follows. □

Let G be a quasi-line graph with canonical stable set S such that G is free-lifted. The following lemma shows that an S-cover of G can be easily updated after an S-lifting.

Lemma 71 *Let $G(V, E)$ be a quasi-line graph and S a canonical stable set in G. Let $M \subseteq E$ be an S-matching of G. Assume that G is free-lifted with respect to S and M. Let $\mathcal{C} = \{(C_v, \overline{C}_v) : v \in S\}$ be an* S-cover *of G. Let $G^{(C_s, \mathcal{K})}$ be an S-lifting of G with respect to the partition $\mathcal{K} = (K_1, K_2, \ldots, K_p)$ of C_s. Let $\{q_i\overline{q}_i : i = 1, \ldots, p\}$ be the set of lifting edges and let $\overline{Q} = \{\overline{q}_1, \ldots, \overline{q}_p\}$ be the corresponding lifting clique (M-clique). Finally let $S^{(C_s, \mathcal{K})}$ and $M^{(C_s, \mathcal{K})}$ be the corresponding extensions of S and M. Then an $S^{(C_s, \mathcal{K})}$-cover $\mathcal{C}^{(C_s, \mathcal{K})}$ of $G^{(C_s, \mathcal{K})}$ can be obtained from $\mathcal{C}$ by removing the clique C_s and adding the family $\mathcal{C}^{\Delta}$ composed by the $2p+1$ cliques $\overline{Q}$, $K_i \cup \{q_i\}$ and $\{q_i, \overline{q}_i\}$ ($i \in \{1, \ldots, p\}$).*

Proof. Let $\overline{q}_h$ be the unique node in $\overline{Q} \cap S^{(C_s, \mathcal{K})}$ and let $\tilde{Q} = \{q_1, \ldots, \overline{q}_h, \ldots, q_p\}$ be the set of lifting nodes belonging to $S^{(C_s, \mathcal{K})}$. Observe that we have $s \in K_h$.

We first prove that each edge uv in G removed by the lifting operation is contained in exactly one clique of $\mathcal{C}$, namely C_s, possibly coincident with $\overline{C}_s$. In fact, if uv is contained in a clique $C_z \in \mathcal{C} \setminus \{C_s, \overline{C}_s\}$, we have that u and v are similar bound nodes in the wing $W(s, z)$. But it is easy to check that an S-lifting never removes edges between similar bound nodes. If uv is contained in $\overline{C}_s \neq C_s$, then $u, v \in C_s \cap \overline{C}_s$. It follows that u (v) is not free, since otherwise it would be either a dominating free node (if it is outer free) or a twin of s and in both cases we would have a contradiction. Hence, either u or v (or both) is a bound node. Assume, without loss of generality, that u is a bound node and belongs to some wing $W(s, r)$. Since C_s is weakly normal in G, we have that r, u and v are adjacent to every node in $\overline{C}_s \setminus C_s \neq \emptyset$. It follows that r is the polar node of C_s and $\overline{C}_s \setminus C_s$ does not contain free nodes. It follows that $G^{(C_s, \mathcal{K})}$ is an S-lifting of type *(i)* and u, v belong to $C_s(r) \cup \{s\} \cup I(s)$ and hence to K_h, contradicting the assumption that uv is removed by the lifting operation.

It follows that C_s is the only clique in $\mathcal{C}$ that is not a clique in $G^{(C_s,\mathcal{K})}$. The new edges in $G^{(C_s,\mathcal{K})}$ having one endpoint in $S^{(C_s,\mathcal{K})}$ are incident either to s or to some node in $\tilde{Q}$. It follows that the closed neighborhood in $G^{(C_s,\mathcal{K})}$ of any node u in $S^{(C_s,\mathcal{K})} \setminus (\{s\} \cup \tilde{Q}) = S \setminus \{s\}$ is covered by the cliques $C_u, \overline{C}_u$ in $\mathcal{C}$. Moreover, the closed neighborhood of s in $G^{(C_s,\mathcal{K})}$ is covered by the cliques $K_h \cup \{q_h\}$ and $\overline{C}_s$, the closed neighborhood of $\overline{q}_h$ is covered by the cliques $\overline{Q}$ and $\{q_h, \overline{q}_h\}$. Finally, the closed neighborhood of q_i $(i \in \{1, \dots, p\} \setminus \{h\})$ is covered by the cliques $K_i \cup \{q_i\}$ and $\{q_i, \overline{q}_i\}$. The Lemma follows. □

In what follows, we call the $S^{(C_s,\mathcal{K})}$-cover $\mathcal{C}^{(C_s,\mathcal{K})} = \mathcal{C} \setminus \{C_s\} \cup \mathcal{C}^{\Delta}$ the *extension* of $\mathcal{C}$.

Lemma 72 *Let $G(V,E)$ be a connected claw-free graph and let S be a canonical stable set of G. Let $M \subseteq E$ be an S-matching of G. Assume that G is free-lifted with respect to S and M. Let $\mathcal{C}$ be an S-*cover *of G and let $G^{(C_s,\mathcal{K})}$ be an S-lifting of G. If Q is a weakly normal clique in $\mathcal{C} \setminus \{C_s\}$ then it is weakly normal in $G^{(C_s,\mathcal{K})}$.*

Proof. Assume that there exists in G a weakly normal clique $Q \in \mathcal{C} \setminus \{C_s\}$ which is not weakly normal in $G^{(C_s,K)}$. Let $W(s,r)$ be the polar wing of C_s (if it exists) and let u be the stable node in Q. Let $x, y \notin Q$ be two non-adjacent nodes in $G^{(C_s,K)}$ with a common neighbor $z \in Q$. Since Q is weakly normal in G, we have two cases: *(a)* z is non-adjacent either to x or to y in G; *(b)* x and y are adjacent in G. In case *(a)* either x or y (but not both) belongs to $\{q_i : i = 1, \dots, p\}$. By symmetry we consider only the case $x \equiv q_1$. It follows that z belongs to K_1 and hence to $C_s \cap Q$. If $u \equiv s$ then we have $Q \equiv \overline{C}_s$ and z belongs to $C_s \cap \overline{C}_s$. Observe that any node in $C_s \cap \overline{C}_s$ is not free, otherwise it would be either a dominating free node or a twin of s and in both cases we would have a contradiction. Consequently, z is a bound node and belongs to some wing $W(s,t)$. Since C_s and $\overline{C}_s$ are both weakly normal in G, we have that t must be adjacent to every node in the symmetric difference of C_s and $\overline{C}_s$. Moreover, any other node in $(C_s \cap \overline{C}_s) \setminus \{s\}$ is also a bound node in some wing $W(s,t')$ with t' adjacent to every node in the symmetric difference of C_s and $\overline{C}_s$. It follows, by claw-freeness, that $t \equiv t'$ and hence that t is adjacent to every node in $N(s)$. But this implies that C_s is not S-liftable, contradicting the assumption. Hence, we can assume $u \neq s$.

Observe that y is adjacent to s and hence belongs to $\overline{C}_s$, since Q is weakly normal in G and both y and s do not belong to Q and are adjacent to $z \in Q$. Analogously, y is adjacent to u, since C_s is weakly normal in G and both y and u do not belong to C_s and are adjacent to $z \in C_s$. It follows that y and z belong to the wing $W(s,u)$. Since C_s intersects more than one wing, we have that there exists some node $b \in C_s$ belonging to a wing $W(s,t)$ $(t \neq u)$. We have that $W(s,t)$ is not the polar wing, since $y \in \overline{C}_s$ does not belong to $W(s,t)$. It follows that b and s belong to different sets of the partition $\mathcal{K}$ of C_s. But this contradicts the existence of the C_s-paw $(s, b : y, u)$.

In case *(b)* both x and y are not lifting nodes and belong to different sets of the partition $\mathcal{K}$ of C_s which is defined as in *(i)* or *(ii)* of Theorem 76. Moreover, z does not belong to C_s, otherwise it would not be adjacent to both x and y in $G^{(C_s,\mathcal{K})}$. It follows that u coincides with s and hence z belongs to $\overline{C}_s$, otherwise the C_s-paw $(x, y : z, u)$ would contradict the liftability of C_s. If both x and y are free, then they belong to different partial wings $C_s(t_1)$ and $C_s(t_2)$ and are adjacent to free nodes $\bar{x} \in F(t_1)$ and $\bar{y} \in F(t_2)$, respectively. We claim that $\bar{x}$ is not adjacent to $\bar{y}$. In fact, otherwise, $\bar{x}, \bar{y}, x, y$ would belong to a connected component H of the dissimilarity graph of G with respect to S intersecting three similarity classes. This in turn would imply that H is a liftable free component containing two free nodes in C_s, contradicting the assumption that G is free-lifted. Since C_s is weakly normal in G and $x \in C_s$ is a common neighbor of $z, \bar{x} \notin C_s$ we have that z is adjacent to $\bar{x}$. Analogously, we have that z is adjacent to $\bar{y}$. But then $(z : s, \bar{x}, \bar{y})$ is a claw in G, a contradiction.

It follows that either x or y is bound. Without loss of generality, assume that x is a bound node in some wing $W(s,t)$. Since C_s is weakly normal in G and $x \in C_s$ is adjacent to $z, t \notin C_s$ we have $zt \in E$. But then $z \in Q$ is adjacent to $t, y \notin Q$ and, since Q is weakly normal in G, we have $yt \in E$. It follows that also y is a bound node in the wing $W(s,t)$ contradicting the hypothesis that x and y belong to different sets of the partition $\mathcal{K}$ of C_s. The theorem follows. $\square$

Theorem 710 *Let $G(V,E)$ be a quasi-line graph and S a canonical stable set in G. Let $M \subseteq E$ be an S-matching of G. Assume that G is free-lifted with respect to S and M. Let $\mathcal{C} = \{(C_v, \overline{C}_v) : v \in S\}$ be an* S-cover *of G and let $\mathcal{L}$ be a list of weakly normal cliques containing all the normal cliques of G which are not M-cliques. Let $G^{(C_s,\mathcal{K})}$ be an S-lifting of G with respect to the partition $\mathcal{K} = (K_1, K_2, \dots, K_p)$ of $C_s \in \mathcal{L}$. Let $\{q_i\overline{q}_i : i = 1, \dots, p\}$ be the set of lifting edges and let $\overline{Q} = \{\overline{q}_1, \dots, \overline{q}_p\}$ be the corresponding lifting clique (M-clique). Finally, let $S^{(C_s,\mathcal{K})}$, $M^{(C_s,\mathcal{K})}$ and $\mathcal{C}^{(C_s,\mathcal{K})}$ be the extensions of S, M and $\mathcal{C}$, respectively. Then we have:*

(a) *a free (bound) node u in G with respect to S is a free (bound) node in $G^{(C_s,\mathcal{K})}$ with respect to $S^{(C_s,\mathcal{K})}$;*
(b) *$G^{(C_s,\mathcal{K})}$ is free-lifted with respect to $S^{(C_s,\mathcal{K})}$ and $M^{(C_s,\mathcal{K})}$;*
(c) *The new clique $K_i \cup \{q_i\}$ ($i \in \{1, \dots, p\}$) is an $M^{(C_s,\mathcal{K})}$-clique if and only if either $s \in K_i$ and $N(s) \setminus C_s = \emptyset$ or $K_i \cap V(M) \neq \emptyset$;*
(d) *a list of weakly normal cliques containing all the normal cliques of $G^{(C_s,\mathcal{K})}$ which are not $M^{(C_s,\mathcal{K})}$-cliques can be constructed as follows: $\mathcal{L}^{(C_s,\mathcal{K})} = \mathcal{L} \setminus \{C_s\} \cup \{K_i \cup \{q_i\} : i \in \{1, \dots, p\}, K_i \cap V(M) = \emptyset\} \setminus \{\{s, q_i\} : N(s) \setminus C_s = \emptyset\}$.*

Proof. Let $\{q_i\overline{q}_i : i = 1, \dots, p\}$ be the set of lifting edges, $\mathcal{K} = (K_1, K_2, \dots, K_p)$ the associated partition of C_s and let $\overline{Q} = \{\overline{q}_1, \dots, \overline{q}_p\}$ be the corresponding M-clique. To prove *(a)* observe that a node $u \in V \setminus S$ is adjacent to a node $z \in S \setminus \{s\}$ in G if and only if they are adjacent in $G^{(C_s,\mathcal{K})}$. Moreover, if u is adjacent to s in G then it is either adjacent to s or to some node $q_i \in S^{(C_s,\mathcal{K})}$ (but not both) in $G^{(C_s,\mathcal{K})}$. It follows that any free (bound) node in G with respect to S is always a free (bound) node in $G^{(C_s,\mathcal{K})}$ with respect to $S^{(C_s,\mathcal{K})}$.

To prove *(b)* first observe that, by construction, each edge in $M^{(C_s,\mathcal{K})}$ is a strongly bisimplicial clique intersecting $S^{(C_s,\mathcal{K})}$. We now show that each free node in $V(M^{(C_s,\mathcal{K})})$ belongs to some liftable free component in $G^{(C_s,\mathcal{K})}$. Let v be a free node in $V(M^{(C_s,\mathcal{K})})$ and let u be the node matched to it by $M^{(C_s,\mathcal{K})}$. By assumption we have $u \in S^{(C_s,\mathcal{K})}$. Moreover, $K_v = N[v] \setminus \{u\}$ is an M-clique composed by nodes free with respect to $S^{(C_s,\mathcal{K})}$. Hence, K_v is a free component in $G^{(C_s,\mathcal{K})}$ (with respect to $S^{(C_s,\mathcal{K})}$). Moreover, by Lemma 31, K_v is weakly normal and, by Theorem 73, K_v is liftable in $G^{(C_s,\mathcal{K})}$ with respect to $\{v\} \subset K_v$. This proves that each free node $v \in V(M^{(Q,K)})$ belongs to a liftable free component in $G^{(C_s,\mathcal{K})}$.

To complete the proof of Property *(b)* we show that each liftable free component H in $G^{(C_s,\mathcal{K})}$ is also a liftable free component in G. To this purpose, observe that H does not contain the nodes q_i and $\overline{q}_i$ $(i = 1, \ldots, p)$ since it contains only free nodes. As a consequence, H is a clique in G, since the new edges in $G^{(C_s,\mathcal{K})}$ have at least one endpoint in the set $\{q_i, \overline{q}_i : i = 1, \ldots, p\}$. Moreover, by Property *(a)*, the nodes of H are also free in G with respect to S.

Suppose that H intersects more than one connected component of the dissimilarity graph G_F of G with respect to S. It follows that there exist nodes $x, y \in H$ which are dissimilar in $G^{(C_s,\mathcal{K})}$ (adjacent to different nodes of $S^{(C_s,\mathcal{K})}$) but belong to different connected components of G_F and hence are similar in G (adjacent to the same node of S). As a consequence one of them, say y, is adjacent to some node q_i $(i \in \{1, \ldots, p\})$ in $G^{(C_s,\mathcal{K})}$ and belongs to C_s while x is adjacent to s and y both in G and in $G^{(C_s,\mathcal{K})}$ and hence belongs to $N(C_s)$. Since y is not adjacent to s in $G^{(C_s,\mathcal{K})}$ and is free, it belongs to the partial wing $K_i = C_s(t)$ for some $t \in S \setminus \{s\}$ and is an outer free node adjacent to a node $\overline{y} \in F(t)$ in G. But then x and $\overline{y}$ are nodes in $N(C_s)$ with the common neighbor $y \in C_s$. If x and $\overline{y}$ are not adjacent in G then C_s is not weakly normal and hence not liftable, a contradiction. It follows that x and $\overline{y}$ are adjacent in G and dissimilar, so G_F contains the path $(y, \overline{y}, x)$ contradicting the assumption that x and y belong to different connected components of G_F. We have thus proved that H is contained in a connected component of G_F.

Suppose now that H is not a maximal clique in G and let x be a node universal to H. Since H is maximal in $G^{(C_s,\mathcal{K})}$ there exists a free node $y \in H$ which is not adjacent to x in $G^{(C_s,\mathcal{K})}$. This means that x belongs to K_i and y belongs to K_j for some pair $K_i \neq K_j \in \mathcal{K}$ and y belongs to $F(s)$ in G. Moreover, since H contains at least two dissimilar nodes, there exists a node $\overline{y} \neq y$ in $H \setminus C_s$ adjacent to a node $t \in S \setminus \{s\}$ both in G and in $G^{(C_s,\mathcal{K})}$ (y belongs to $W(s,t)$ in G). Since x is universal to H in G, the node x is adjacent to $\overline{y}$. Moreover, the node s is adjacent to y and non-adjacent to $\overline{y}$ in G and hence $x \neq s$. Now, if x is not adjacent to t then the edge xy is the base of the Q-paw $(x, y : \overline{y}, t)$, contradicting the assumption that x and y are not adjacent in $G^{(C_s,\mathcal{K})}$. If, conversely, x is adjacent to t then it is a bound node in $W(s,t)$ in G. Since $G^{(C_s,\mathcal{K})}$ is an S-lifting which separates a free and a bound node in the same wing, it follows that $\mathcal{K}$ is defined as in *(ii)* of Theorem 76 and hence t is the polar node of C_s, $K_i = W^B(s,t) \cap C_s$ and $K_j = (C_s \cap W^F(s,r)) \cup \{s\} \cup I(s)$. Let z be a free node in $W^F(s,t)) \setminus C_s$ (it exists by definition). Both z and $\overline{y}$ belong to $N(C_s)$ and have the common neighbor $y \in C_s$. Since C_s is weakly normal, we have that z and $\overline{y}$ are adjacent both in G and in $G^{(C_s,\mathcal{K})}$ and are dissimilar, implying that z belongs to H. But then we have $zx \in E$, the nodes z and t are not adjacent and have the common neighbor $x \in C_s$, contradicting the assumption that C_s is weakly normal. It follows that H is a maximal clique in G and hence induces a free component.

Finally, suppose that H is not liftable and hence, by Theorem 73, that it is not weakly normal. It follows that in G there exists two non-adjacent nodes $x, y \in N(H)$ with a common neighbor $z \in H$. Since H is liftable (and weakly normal) in $G^{(C_s,\mathcal{K})}$ we have that either x or y is non-adjacent to z in $G^{(C_s,\mathcal{K})}$. Without loss of generality, suppose that x is not adjacent to z in $G^{(C_s,\mathcal{K})}$ and hence that both x and z belong to C_s. It follows that z is adjacent (in $G^{(C_s,\mathcal{K})}$) to a lifting node in $\{q_i, \overline{q}_i : i = 1, \ldots, p\}$, let k be such a node. Since y is not adjacent to x in

G, it does not belong to C_s and hence it is non-adjacent to the lifting nodes. But then, z is the common neighbor (in $G^{(C_s,\mathcal{K})}$) of the non-adjacent nodes y and k, contradicting the assumption that H is weakly normal in $G^{(C_s,\mathcal{K})}$.

Hence, we have proved that H is a liftable free component in G. Since G is free-lifted, we have that H is an M-clique and, consequently, an $M^{(C_s,\mathcal{K})}$-clique in $G^{(C_s,\mathcal{K})}$. This completes the proof of Property *(b)*.

To prove Property *(c)* observe first that if $K_i \cap V(M) = \emptyset$ and either $s \notin K_i$ or $N(s) \setminus C_s \neq \emptyset$ then $K_i \cup \{q_i\}$ is not an $M^{(C_s,\mathcal{K})}$-clique.

To prove sufficiency, note that if $s \in K_i$ and $N(s) \setminus C_s = \emptyset$ there exists no polar node of C_s, $K_i = \{s\} \cup I(s)$ and the new clique $K_i \cup \{q_i\}$ is an $M^{(C_s,\mathcal{K})}$-clique.

Assume now that $K_i \cap V(M) \neq \emptyset$ and let r be the polar node of C_s (if it exists). Observe that, by Definition 73, either we have *(i)* $K_i = C_s(t_i)$ with $t_i \in S \setminus \{r\}$, or *(ii)* $K_i = C_s(r) \cup \{s\} \cup I(s)$, or *(iii)* $K_i = (C_s \cap W^F(s,r)) \cup \{s\} \cup I(s)$, or *(iv)* $K_i = W^B(s,r) \cap C_s$. The case *(ii)* occurs if $F(s) \setminus C_s = \emptyset$ while cases *(iii)* and *(iv)* occur if $F(s) \setminus C_s \neq \emptyset$.

If K_i contains some node $u \in V(M) \setminus S$, let v be the node in $V(M) \cap S$ matched to u by M. Since C_s is not the M-clique $\{u,v\}$, we have that v does not belong to C_s. If v is the polar node r of C_s, we have that $N(s) \setminus C_s$ is non-empty and is contained in $W(s,v)$. Since $\{u,v\}$ is a strongly bisimplicial clique, there exists no bound node z in $N(s) \setminus C_s$ (otherwise the node $s \in N(u)$ would be adjacent to the node $z \in N(v)$). It follows that $F(s) \setminus C_s \neq \emptyset$ and hence $K_i = W^B(s,v) \cap C_s$ and we are in case *(iv)*. If, conversely, v is not the polar node of C_s, then $K_i = C_s(v)$ and we are in case *(i)*. In both cases $K_i = \{u\}$, otherwise the hypothesis that $\{u,v\}$ is a strongly bisimplicial clique would be contradicted. It follows that the new clique $K_i \cup \{q_i\}$ is an $M^{(C_s,\mathcal{K})}$-clique.

If K_i contains some node $u \in V(M) \cap S$, we have $u \equiv s$ and we are either in case *(ii)* or in case *(iii)*. Let v be the node in $V(M) \setminus S$ matched to s by M. We have $N(s) \setminus C_s = \{v\}$ and, since v is non-adjacent to any node in $C_s \setminus \{s\}$, there exists no polar node of C_s. It follows that, in both cases, $K_i = \{s\} \cup I(s)$ and the new clique $K_i \cup \{q_i\}$ is an $M^{(C_s,\mathcal{K})}$-clique. This concludes the proof of Property *(c)*.

To prove Property *(d)* we first prove the following:

Claim 1. Any maximal clique belonging both to G and to $G^{(C_s,\mathcal{K})}$ which is not weakly normal in G is also not weakly normal in $G^{(C_s,\mathcal{K})}$.

Proof. By contradiction, assume that there exists a maximal clique Q belonging both to G and to $G^{(C_s,\mathcal{K})}$ which is not weakly normal in G but is weakly normal in $G^{(C_s,\mathcal{K})}$. It follows that in G there exist non-adjacent nodes $x, y \in N(Q)$ having a common neighbor $z \in Q$ but such a configuration is not preserved in $G^{(C_s,\mathcal{K})}$. Since the lifting operation does not remove nodes nor adds edges connecting previously existing nodes, we have that one of the two edges xz and yz has been removed; without loss of generality, assume that x and z are not adjacent in $G^{(C_s,\mathcal{K})}$. It follows that the nodes x and z belong to different sets in $\mathcal{K} = \{K_1, K_2, \ldots, K_p\}$, where $K_i = N(q_i) \cap C_s$ $(i \in \{1, \ldots, p\}$; say $x \in K_j$ and $z \in K_h$. But then in $G^{(C_s,\mathcal{K})}$ q_h and y are non-adjacent nodes in $N(Q)$ having the common neighbor $z \in Q$, contradicting the assumption that Q is weakly normal in $G^{(C_s,\mathcal{K})}$. The claim follows.
End of Claim 1.

Now, by Theorem 53 the normal (and hence weakly normal) cliques in $G^{(C_s,\mathcal{K})}$ belong either to the extension $\mathcal{C}^{(C_s,\mathcal{K})}$ of $\mathcal{C}$ or to the family of the free components of $G^{(C_s,\mathcal{K})}$ with respect to $S^{(C_s,\mathcal{K})}$. But, by Property *(b)* $G^{(C_s,\mathcal{K})}$ is free-lifted with respect to $S^{(C_s,\mathcal{K})}$, so the free components are $M^{(C_s,\mathcal{K})}$-cliques. It follows that the normal cliques in $G^{(C_s,\mathcal{K})}$ belong to $\mathcal{C}^{(C_s,\mathcal{K})}$. By Lemma 71 $\mathcal{C}^{(C_s,\mathcal{K})} = \mathcal{C} \setminus \{C_s\} \cup \mathcal{C}^{\Delta}$ and, by the previous Claim, no clique in $\mathcal{C}$ which is not weakly normal in G can be weakly normal in $G^{(C_s,\mathcal{K})}$. It follows that the list $\mathcal{L}^{(C_s,\mathcal{K})}$ can be chosen in the family $\mathcal{L} \cup \mathcal{C}^{\Delta}$. More precisely, to obtain $\mathcal{L}^{(C_s,\mathcal{K})}$, we have to remove from $\mathcal{L} \cup \mathcal{C}^{\Delta}$ the clique C_s and all the cliques which are not weakly normal in $G^{(C_s,\mathcal{K})}$ or are $M^{(C_s,\mathcal{K})}$-cliques. But, by Lemma 72, all the cliques in $\mathcal{L} \setminus \{C_s\}$ are also weakly normal in $G^{(C_s,\mathcal{K})}$. On the other hand, since for $i \in \{1, \ldots, p\}$ $\{q_i, \overline{q}_i\}$ is bisimplicial and $N(\{q_i, \overline{q}_i\})$ is covered in $G^{(C_s,\mathcal{K})}$ by $\overline{Q} \setminus \{\overline{q}_i\}$ and K_i, by Lemma 31 the new cliques $K_i \cup \{q_i\}$ $(i \in \{1, \ldots, p\})$ are weakly normal in $G^{(C_s,\mathcal{K})}$. It follows that we have to remove from $\mathcal{L} \cup \mathcal{C}^{\Delta}$ the clique C_s and all the cliques which are $M^{(C_s,\mathcal{K})}$-cliques. The following claim characterizes the new cliques $K_i \cup \{q_i\}$ $(i \in \{1, \ldots, p\})$ which are $M^{(C_s,\mathcal{K})}$-cliques.

Property *(c)* now implies Property *(d)*. The theorem follows. □

We now introduce a proper sub-class of quasi-line graphs (*basic quasi-line*) having a very simple structure which allows to solve the maximum weight stable set problem by decomposition.

Definition 76 *Let $G(V, E)$ be a quasi-line graph. If there exists a matching $M \subseteq E$ whose edges are bisimplicial cliques and such that each connected component C of $G - M$ is either a clique or a* {claw, net}-free *graph with $|C \cap V(M)| \leq 2$ then the graph G is said to be* basic quasi-line *with respect to M.* □

In the following two theorems we first characterize the basic quasi-line graphs in terms of S-liftability and then prove that every quasi-line graph can be turned into a basic quasi-line graph by a series of liftings. Finally, we show that the complexity of the overall procedure is not higher than that of solving the MWSS problem on line graphs.

Theorem 711 *Let $G(V, E)$ be a quasi-line graph, S a canonical stable set and M an S-matching. Assume that G is free-lifted with respect to S and M and that each clique Q belonging to an S-cover $\mathcal{C}$ either is an M-clique or is not S-liftable. Then G is basic quasi-line with respect to M.*

Proof. We first prove that any node $u \in S$ which is not contained in an M-clique has $k_u \leq 2$. In fact, if u is a stable node with $k_u \geq 3$ we have, by Theorem 79, that at least one of the cliques of the S-Cover containing u is S-liftable. Since such a clique is not an M-clique, the assumption is contradicted.

Now, let C be any connected component of $G - M$ which is not an M-clique and let $S_C = C \cap S$. Let $H(S_C, T)$ be the graph where xy is an edge in T if and only if $x, y \in S_C$ and $W(x, y)$ is a wing in G not contained in $V(M)$.

Claim (i). Each node u in S_C has degree either 0, 1 *or* 2 *in H; moreover if $u \in V(M)$ then it has degree at most* 1.

Proof. Let u be a node in H. By assumption, u has wing number not greater than 2. Moreover, if $u \in H \cap V(M)$, then one of the wings defined by u is contained

in $V(M)$ and does not belong to C. But then u defines at most one wing not contained in $V(M)$ and hence has degree at most 1 in H.
End of Claim (i).

Claim (ii). The graph H is connected.

Proof. Assume conversely that there exist at least two connected components C_1, C_2 of H. Since C is a connected component in $G - M$, each pair of nodes in S_C is connected by a (shortest) path in $G - M$. Let $P = (x, z_1, \dots, z_h, y)$ $(h \geq 1)$ be a shortest path connecting two nodes x, y in different components of H. Without loss of generality, assume $x \in C_1$ and $y \in C_2$. Observe that, since the nodes in $V(M)$ are simplicial in $G-M$, the internal nodes of P belong to $V \setminus V(M)$. Moreover, by minimality of P, $z_i \notin S$ $(i = 1, \dots, h)$ and $p \geq 2$, otherwise $W(x, y)$ would be a wing containing $z_1 \in V \setminus V(M)$, contradicting the assumption that x and y do not belong to the same connected component of H. If $h \geq 3$ we have that there exists at least one node $t \in S$ adjacent to z_2 and different from x and y. Since $z_2 t$ does not belong to M, we have $t \in S_C$. If $t \notin C_1$ then $tz_1 \notin E$ and the path (x, z_1, z_2, t) contradicts the minimality of P. It follows $t \in C_1$ and hence t, y are in different connected components of H. But then either $(t, z_2, z_3, \dots, z_h, y)$ or $(t, z_3, \dots, z_h, y)$ is a path connecting two nodes in different components of H which is shorter than P, a contradiction. Consequently, we have $h = 2$. Assume that z_1 (z_2) is a bound node. Then there exists a node $t \in S$ adjacent to z_1 (z_2) and different from x and y. By claw-freeness t is also adjacent to z_2 (z_1). The edges $z_1 t$ and $z_2 t$ do not belong to M and hence $t \in S_C$. It follows that both $W(x, t)$ and $W(y, t)$ are wings containing some node in $V \setminus V(M)$ and hence t belongs to both C_1 and C_2, a contradiction. It follows that both z_1 and z_2 are free nodes. But then x and y define a wing containing some node in $V \setminus V(M)$, again a contradiction.
End of Claim (ii).

By Claims *(i)* and *(ii)* H is either an isolated node, a path with at least one edge or a cycle. In the first case the theorem easily follows. Consequently, we can make the following:

Assumption (i). $|S_C| = p \geq 2$.

By Assumption *(i)* H is either a path with at least one edge or a cycle and there exists an ordering $\{s_1, s_2, \dots, s_p\}$ of S_C such that each s_i $(2 \leq i \leq p-1)$ defines wings with s_{i-1} and with s_{i+1}. An easy consequence of Claim *(i)* and the assumption that $k_u \leq 2$ for each $u \in S$ is the following.

Claim (iii). $S_C \cap V(M) \subseteq \{s_1, s_p\}$ *and the nodes* $s_2, \dots, s_{p-1}$ *define exactly two wings.*

Claim (iv). If v belongs to $V(M) \cap C$ and does not belong to S_C then either $v \in N(s_1)$ or $v \in N(s_p)$.

Proof. Let $u \in V(M) \cap S$ be the node matched to v by M. Since C is not an M-clique and G is free-lifted, the node v is not free and hence is adjacent to a node $s_j \in S_C$. If $j \notin \{1, p\}$ then s_j defines the wings $W(s_{j-1}, s_j)$, $W(s_j, s_{j+1})$ and $W(s_j, u)$ contradicting the assumption that $k_v \leq 2$. The claim follows.
End of Claim (iv).

Claim (v). $N[s_1] \cap C$ $(N[s_p] \cap C)$ *contains at most one node in* $V(M)$.

Proof. By symmetry, it is sufficient to prove the first statement. Assume first $s_1 \in V(M)$ and suppose, by contradiction, that s_1 is adjacent to a node $v \in V(M) \cap C$.

Let u and z be the nodes matched to v and s_1, respectively, by M. Observe that z and u belong to M-cliques Q_z and Q_u, respectively, and hence do not belong to C. Moreover, the cliques Q_z and Q_u are different since $\{s_1, z\}$ and $\{u, v\}$ are strongly bisimplicial cliques. Let y be the stable node in Q_z. Since u and y do not belong to C, We have that $u, y \neq s_1, s_2$ and hence that s_1 defines three distinct wings $W(s_1, u)$, $W(s_1, s_2)$ and $W(s_1, y)$ contradicting the assumption that $k_{s_1} \leq 2$.

Assume now $s_1 \notin V(M)$ and suppose, by contradiction, that s_1 is adjacent to nodes $v_1, v_2 \in V(M) \cap C$. Let u_1, u_2 be the nodes matched to v_1, v_2 by M. We have that u_1 and u_2 do not belong to C. It follows that $u_1, u_2 \neq s_1, s_2$ and hence that s_1 defines the wings $W(s_1, u_1)$, $W(s_1, u_2)$ and $W(s_1, s_2)$, contradicting the assumption that $k_{s_1} \leq 2$. The claim follows.
End of Claim (v).

By the above claims we have that C contains at most two nodes in $V(M)$, namely $v_1 \in N[s_1]$ and $v_p \in N[s_p]$. Consequently $\delta(C)$ consists of at most two edges of M.

To complete the proof we have now to show that $G[C]$ does not contain normal cliques. Suppose, by contradiction, that there exists a normal clique Q in $G[C]$. Observe that, by assumption, Q is not an M-clique (it would coincide with C) and is not S-liftable. Moreover, by Corollary 31, Q is weakly normal. Consequently, by Theorem 53, it is either a free component of G with respect to S or contains a node $u \in S$. If Q were a free component, by Theorem 73 it would be liftable. Since G is free-lifted, by Definition 74 Q would be an M-clique, contradicting the assumption.

It follows that Q contains a node $u \in S$. By Theorem 31 (applied to $G[C]$), there exist three nodes $x, y, z \in C$ with the property that x, y are two Q-distant nodes in $N(Q) \setminus N(u)$ and z belongs to $N(u) \setminus Q$ and is null to $\{x, y\}$. Let $\bar{x}$ and $\bar{y}$ be two nodes in Q which are adjacent to x and y and not adjacent to y and x, respectively. The nodes $\bar{x}$ and $\bar{y}$ exist since x and y belong to $N(Q)$ and are Q-distant. Moreover, $\bar{x}$ and $\bar{y}$ are not adjacent to z (since Q is weakly normal) and do not belong to $I(u)$ (since they are adjacent to $x \notin N(u)$ and $y \notin N(u)$, respectively). It follows that $\bar{x}$ and $\bar{y}$ belong to wings (possibly coincident) $W(u, s_1)$ and $W(u, s_2)$, respectively. Consequently, x belongs to $N[s_1]$ and y belongs to $N[s_2]$. Observe that $\bar{x}$ does not belong to $V(M)$ for, otherwise, it would be matched to x by M contradicting the assumption that x belongs to C. Analogously, $\bar{y} \notin V(M)$. Consequently, if $W(u, s_1)$ and $W(u, s_2)$ are distinct wings the S-partition $\mathcal{K}$ of Q contains the partial wings $Q(s_1), Q(s_2) \nsubseteq V(M)$. But then Q is S-liftable, a contradiction. It follows that $s_1 \equiv s_2 \equiv s$.

In this case we have that the non-adjacent nodes x and y cannot be both free and neither of them coincides with s. Suppose, without loss of generality, that x is not free and hence is a bound node adjacent to s and $s' \neq u, s$. Since $\bar{x} \in W(u, s)$ we have that $\bar{x}s' \notin E$ and, by claw-freeness, that s is adjacent to $\bar{x}$. It follows that s defines at least two wings, $W(s, u)$ and $(W(s, s')$. The node y is adjacent to s and not adjacent to x and $\bar{x}$. It follows that both x and $\bar{x}$ belong to a clique C_s of some S-cover $\mathcal{C}'$ of G while y belongs to $\overline{C}_s$. Since Q is normal, by Theorem 53 it belongs to every S-cover, so we can assume $\mathcal{C}' \equiv \mathcal{C}$.

Suppose that C_s is an M-clique. Since $sy \in \delta(C_s)$, we have that sy belongs to M. But this is impossible since s is adjacent to $\bar{x}$, y adjacent to $\bar{y}$ and $\bar{x}\bar{y} \in E$, contradicting the fact that sy is strongly bisimplicial. It follows that C_s is not an M-clique.

If $ys' \notin E$, C_s is a normal clique (since $(s, x, \bar{x} : y, s', u)$ is a net in G). Moreover, if y is a bound node, then neither $W(s, s')$ nor $W(s, u)$ is the polar wing of C_s; on the other hand, if y is free then $F(s) \setminus C_s$ is non-empty. In both cases, by Definition 73 the S-partition of C_s contains at least three sets and hence C_s is S-liftable, contradicting the hypothesis.

Hence, we have that $ys' \in E$ and, by claw-freeness $s\bar{y} \in E$ ($\bar{y} \in \overline{C}_s$). Moreover, $zs' \notin E$ (otherwise $(s' : x, y, z)$ would be a claw in G) and $zs \notin E$ (otherwise $(s : x, y, z)$ would be a claw in G). We claim that either C_s or $\overline{C}_s$ is weakly normal. Suppose the contrary. It follows that both C_s and $\overline{C}_s$ are not normal and hence, by Theorem 79, $k_s = 2$. Assume now that q is a free node in $F(s)$. The node q cannot belong to $C_s \cap \overline{C}_s$ for, otherwise, it would be either a twin of s or a dominating free node. Without loss of generality, we can assume $q \in C_s \setminus \overline{C}_s$. But then the net $(s, y, \bar{y} : q, s', u)$ contradicts the assumption that $\overline{C}_s$ is not normal. It follows that $F(s) = \emptyset$ and hence each node in $N(s)$ is adjacent either to s' or to u. Since C_s is not weakly normal, there exists a node $b \in C_s$ which is the common neighbor of two non-adjacent nodes $b_1, b_2 \in N(C_s)$. By claw-freeness either b_1 or b_2, say b_1, is adjacent to s and hence belongs to $\overline{C}_s \setminus C_s$ and is adjacent to y and $\bar{y}$. Moreover, b_2 is non-adjacent to s (otherwise it would belong to C_s).

We claim that b_1 is adjacent to x. Assume, by contradiction, that $b_1x \notin E$. It follows that b_2 is adjacent to x, otherwise $(b : b_1, b_2, x)$ would be a claw in G. Moreover, b_2 is adjacent to s' (otherwise $(x : s, s', b_2)$ would be a claw in G). Assume that b_2 belongs to Q. Hence, Q intersects the two wings $W(u, s)$ and $W(u, s')$ and, since z is non-adjacent to both s and s', s and s' do not cover $N(u) \setminus Q$. It follows that Q is S-liftable, a contradiction.

Hence, we have $b_2 \notin Q$. Assume b_2 is adjacent to $\bar{x}$. it follows that b_2 is adjacent to u (otherwise $(\bar{x} : s, u, b_2)$ would be a claw in G) and non-adjacent to z (otherwise $(b_2 : s', \bar{x}, z)$ would be a claw in G). But then b_2 belongs to Q, a contradiction.

Hence, we have $b_2\bar{x} \notin E$. It follows that b_1 is adjacent to $\bar{x}$ (otherwise $(b : b_1, b_2, \bar{x})$ would be a claw in G). But then, x and b_1 are two non-adjacent nodes in $N(Q)$ with the common neighbor $\bar{x} \in Q$ contradicting the assumption that Q is weakly normal.

It follows that b_1 is adjacent to x as claimed. Consequently, b_1 is non-adjacent to z (otherwise $(b_1 : x, y, z)$ would be a claw in G) and non-adjacent to any node u' in $S \setminus \{s, s'\}$ (otherwise $(b_1 : x, y, u')$ would be a claw in G). But, since $F(s) = \emptyset$, b_1 is a bound node and so it must be adjacent to s and s'. If $b_1\bar{x} \notin E$ then $b_2\bar{x} \in E$ (otherwise $(b : b_1, b_2, \bar{x})$ would be a claw in G). If $b_2 \notin Q$ then b_2 and s are two non-adjacent nodes in $N(Q)$ with the common neighbor $\bar{x} \in Q$, contradicting the assumption that Q is weakly normal. It follows that b_2 belongs to Q and hence is adjacent to u and $\bar{y}$. Moreover, b_2 is non-adjacent to s', otherwise Q would intersect the two wings $W(u, s)$ and $W(u, s')$ with s and s' not covering $N(u) \setminus Q$. But this would imply that Q is S-liftable, a contradiction. Consider now the node b, the common neighbor of b_1 and b_2 in C_s. It is a bound node non-adjacent to s' (otherwise $(b : b_2, s, s')$ would be a claw in G). It follows that b is adjacent to u; moreover b is not adjacent to y (otherwise $(b : x, y, u)$ would be a claw in G).

If b_1 is adjacent to $\bar{x}$ then $(b_1 : s', y, \bar{y}, \bar{x}, x)$ is a 5-wheel, contradicting the assumption that G is a quasi-line graph. Hence we have that b_1 is non-adjacent to $\bar{x}$. It follows that b is non-adjacent to z (otherwise $(b : b_1, \bar{x}, z)$ would be a claw in G). If b is adjacent to $\bar{y}$ then $(b_1 : s', y, \bar{y}, b, x)$ is a 5-wheel contradicting the assumption that G is quasi-line. It follows that b is non-adjacent to $\bar{y}$. But then $(u : b, z, \bar{y})$ is a claw in G, a contradiction. The theorem follows. $\square$

Theorem 712 *Let $G(V, E)$ be a quasi-line graph and S a canonical stable set in G. Let $M \subseteq E$ be an S-matching of G and assume that G is free-lifted with respect to S and M. By a series of liftings one can produce, in $\mathcal{O}(|V|^2)$ time, a graph $\tilde{G}(\tilde{V}, \tilde{E})$ with $\tilde{V} \supseteq V$, an extension $\tilde{S}$ of S and an extension $\tilde{M}$ of M with the property that $|\tilde{V}| = \mathcal{O}(|V|)$ and $\tilde{G}$ is basic quasi-line.*

Proof. By Theorem 53 the normal cliques of G belong to $\mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{F}$, where $\mathcal{F}$ is the family of the free components of G with respect to S and $\mathcal{C}$ is any S-cover of G. Moreover, since G is free-lifted, the normal cliques in $\mathcal{F}$ are M-cliques. Hence, the normal cliques which are not M-cliques belong to $\mathcal{C}$. Let $\mathcal{L}$ be the list of weakly normal cliques in $\mathcal{C}$ which are not M-cliques. Observe that such cliques do not intersect normal free components (since G is free-lifted) and, by Theorem 76, each one of them is liftable with respect to its S-partition. Moreover, by Theorem 71, the list $\mathcal{L}$ can be constructed in $\mathcal{O}(|V|^2)$ time and contains $\mathcal{O}(|V|)$ elements. We also construct the family $\mathcal{W} = \{\mathcal{W}(u) : u \in V \setminus S\}$ where $\mathcal{W}(u)$ is some (arbitrary) wing $W(s, t)$ containing u (represented by $\{s, t\}$); we set $\mathcal{W}(u) = \emptyset$ if u is an inner free node. Observe that such a family can also be constructed in $\mathcal{O}(|V|^2)$ time. In fact, in $\mathcal{O}(|E|)$ time we can associate with each node $u \in V \setminus S$ the set $N(u) \cap S$ (containing one or two nodes) and thus partition the set $V \setminus S$ into the classes of free and bound nodes. Again, in $\mathcal{O}(|E|)$ time we can associate with each outer free node u another free node $\overline{u} \in N(u)$ such that $S(u) \neq S(\overline{u})$. Finally, in $\mathcal{O}(|V|)$ time, for each bound node u, we set $\mathcal{W}(u) = \{s, t\} \equiv N(u) \cap S$ and for each outer free node u we set $\mathcal{W}(u) = \{S(u), S(\overline{u})\}$.

Let C_s be any clique in $\mathcal{L}$ ($C_s \cap S = \{s\}$) and let $\overline{C}_s$ be the other clique in $\mathcal{L}$ containing s (if it exists). Observe that, since G is free-lifted, every node u in C_s ($\overline{C}_s$) belongs to a single wing, namely $\mathcal{W}(u)$. It is easy to see that in $\mathcal{O}(|C_s \cup \overline{C}_s|)$ time we can find the polar node r of C_s (if any), construct the S-partition $\mathcal{K}$ of C_s and check whether C_s is S-liftable. Moreover, since each node in V belongs to at most four cliques of $\mathcal{L}$, in $\mathcal{O}(|V|)$ time we can find an S-liftable clique in $\mathcal{L}$, if any exists. If $\mathcal{L}$ does not contain S-liftable cliques then, by Theorem 711, for each connected component C of $G - M$ which is not an M-clique $G[C]$ does not contain normal cliques and $\delta(C)$ consists of at most two edges of M and, by letting $\tilde{G} \equiv G$ and $\tilde{M} \equiv M$, the theorem follows.

Assume, on the other hand, that C_s is an S-liftable clique in $\mathcal{L}$ and let $\mathcal{K}$ be its S-partition. By lifting G with respect to C_s and $\mathcal{K}$ (S-lifting) we obtain a new graph $G^{(C_s,\mathcal{K})}$. Let $S^{(C_s,\mathcal{K})}$ and $M^{(C_s,\mathcal{K})}$ be the corresponding extensions of S and M. Observe that G, S and M can be updated to $G^{(C_s,\mathcal{K})}$, $S^{(C_s,\mathcal{K})}$ and $M^{(C_s,\mathcal{K})}$, respectively, in $\mathcal{O}(|V|)$ time. Moreover, by *(d)* of Theorem 710, a list $\mathcal{L}^{(C_s,\mathcal{K})}$ of weakly normal cliques containing all the normal cliques of $G^{(C_s,\mathcal{K})}$ which are not $M^{(C_s,\mathcal{K})}$-cliques can be obtained from $\mathcal{L}$ (in the same time complexity).

By *(a)* of Theorem 710, a free (bound) node in G with respect to S is free (bound) in $G^{(C_s,\mathcal{K})}$ with respect to $S^{(C_s,\mathcal{K})}$. Hence, it is easy to see that a family

$\mathcal{W}^{(C_s,\mathcal{K})}=\{\mathcal{W}^{(C_s,\mathcal{K})}(u) : u\in V^{(C_s,\mathcal{K})}\setminus S^{(C_s,\mathcal{K})}\}$ (where $\mathcal{W}^{(C_s,\mathcal{K})}(u)$ is some wing containing u in $G^{(C_s,\mathcal{K})}$ with respect to $S^{(C_s,\mathcal{K})}$) can also be obtained from $\mathcal{W}$ in time $\mathcal{O}(|V^{(C_s,\mathcal{K})}|)$.

By Theorems 45, 47 and 710 $G^{(C_s,\mathcal{K})}$ is quasi-line, $S^{(C_s,\mathcal{K})}$ is canonical and $G^{(C_s,\mathcal{K})}$ is free-lifted with respect to $S^{(C_s,\mathcal{K})}$ and $M^{(C_s,\mathcal{K})}$. Hence, $G^{(C_s,\mathcal{K})}$, $S^{(C_s,\mathcal{K})}$ and $M^{(C_s,\mathcal{K})}$ satisfy the hypotheses of Theorem 711 and we can iterate the argument.

Denote by $G^i(V^i,E^i)$, S^i, M^i, $\mathcal{C}^i$ and $\mathcal{L}^i$ the graph, canonical stable set, S^i-matching, S^i-cover lifting and list containing the candidate S^i-liftable cliques, respectively, obtained at the i-th iteration. We claim that after $T=\mathcal{O}(|V|)$ liftings we obtain a quasi-line graph G^T, a canonical stable set S^T and an S^T-matching M^T such that any clique Q belonging to an S^T-cover is either an M^T-clique or is not S^T-liftable.

Let C be the S^i-liftable clique in $\mathcal{L}^i$ lifted at the i-th iteration and let $\mathcal{K}=\{K_1,\ldots,K_p\}$ be its S^i-partition.

Claim (i). C contains at most one node in $V(M^i)\setminus V(M)$ and at least two cliques of $\mathcal{K}$ contain some node in V.

Proof. If C is a clique of the original graph G then it does not contain nodes in $V(M^i)\setminus V(M)$. If conversely, C has been produced by lifting some clique Q in a previous iteration, then it has the form $C=K\cup\{q\}$ with q a lifting node and K belonging to the partition of Q. But then, by Property *(c)* of Theorem 710 K does not contain a node in $V(M^i)$, otherwise C would be an M^i-clique and would not belong to $\mathcal{L}^i$. It follows that $q\in V(M^i)\setminus V(M)$ is the only lifting node in C. Moreover, since C is S^i-liftable, we have that either there are two cliques in $\mathcal{K}$ which are not contained in $V(M^i)$ or $|\mathcal{K}|\geq 3$. Since at most one clique in $\mathcal{K}$ contains a node in $V(M^i)\setminus V(M)$, in both cases at least two cliques in $\mathcal{K}$ contain some node in V.
End of Claim (i).

Let n^i be the number of cliques containing nodes of V in the S^i-cover $\mathcal{C}^i$. By Claim *(i)* and Lemma 71, we have that n^{i+1} is strictly greater than n^i. Since, as already observed, each node in V is contained in at most four cliques of $\mathcal{C}^i$, we also have $n^i\leq|\mathcal{C}^i|\leq 4|V|$. It follows that, as claimed, after at most $4|V|$ iterations we obtain a quasi-line graph $\tilde{G}\equiv G^T$, a canonical stable set $\tilde{S}\equiv S^T$ and an S^T-matching $\tilde{M}\equiv M^T$ such that any clique Q belonging to an S^T-cover is either an M^T-clique or is not S^T-liftable.

Now observe that each connected component C of $\tilde{G}-\tilde{M}$ is of one of the following three types: *(i)* C is a lifting clique produced at some previous iteration; *(ii)* $C=\{u,\bar{u}\}$ is an $\tilde{M}$-clique produced by lifting some clique Q containing the node $u\in\tilde{V}\setminus V$; *(iii)* C is an $\tilde{M}$-clique containing some node of V; *(iv)* C is not an $\tilde{M}$-clique. By Claim *(i)*, any clique Q lifted in some iteration contains at most one node not in V and hence we have $\mathcal{O}(|V|)$ components of type *(ii)*. Moreover, each component of type *(iii)* or *(iv)* contains at least one node in V, so the number of such components is $\mathcal{O}(|V|)$. In addition, a component of type *(ii)* contains exactly two nodes $\tilde{V}\setminus V$, a component of type *(iii)* contains, by Claim *(i)*, at most one node in $\tilde{V}\setminus V$ and a component of type *(iv)* contains, by Theorem 711, at most two nodes in $\tilde{V}\setminus V$. It follows that the number of nodes in $\tilde{V}\setminus V$ contained in all the components of type *(ii)*, *(iii)* and *(iv)* is also $\mathcal{O}(|V|)$. Finally, observe that each node in a component of type *(i)* is matched by $\tilde{M}$ with a node contained in some component of type *(ii)*, *(iii)* or *(iv)*, so the number of nodes in $\tilde{V} \setminus V$ contained in components of type *(i)* is also $\mathcal{O}(|V|)$. Hence we have $|\tilde{V}| = \mathcal{O}(|V|)$ and the theorem follows. $\square$

The previous results (Theorems 77 and 712) show that, given a quasi-line graph $G(V, E)$, a canonical stable set S, an S-matching M and a weighting vector w, we can produce in $\mathcal{O}(|V|^2)$ time by a sequence of liftings (S-liftings), a canonical stable set $\tilde{S}$, an $\tilde{S}$-matching $\tilde{M}$ and a weighting vector $\tilde{w}$ which are, respectively, the extensions of S, M and w in a basic quasi-line graph $\tilde{G}(\tilde{V}, \tilde{E})$ with respect to $\tilde{M}$. The graph $\tilde{G}$ has the property that $\tilde{V} \supseteq V$, $|\tilde{V}| = \mathcal{O}(|V|)$ and that each connected component of $\tilde{G} - \tilde{M}$ is either an $\tilde{M}$-clique or a {claw, net}-free graph.

8 Conclusion

A claw-free graph H is *basic* if there exists a matching M (*basic matching* of H) such that each connected component C of $H - M$ which is not an M-clique satisfies $|V(M) \cap C| \leq 2$ and is either a {claw, net}-free graph or $\alpha(C \setminus V(M)) \leq 3$. The results of the last two sections show that a claw-free graph $G(V, E)$ with a canonical stable set S, an S-matching M and a weighting vector w can always be lifted to a basic claw-free graph $\bar{G}$ with a canonical stable set $\bar{S}$, an $\bar{S}$-matching $\bar{M}$ and a weighting vector $\bar{w}$ such that $\bar{S}$, $\bar{M}$ and $\bar{w}$ are the extensions of S, M and w, respectively and $\bar{M}$ is a basic matching of $\bar{G}$.

Now, by applying the construction proposed by Faenza et al. [1] we can replace each connected component of $\bar{G} - \bar{M}$ which is not a clique by a suitable "gadget" and produce a new graph H and a weighting vector w_H with the property that H is a line-graph. Hence, we can compute a MWSS S^*_H of H with respect to the weighting w_H in $\mathcal{O}(|V|^2 \log(|V|))$ time by using a standard matching algorithm. A MWSS S^* of G is easily obtainable from $\bar{S}$.

As to the overall complexity, observe that computing the weighting vector w_H requires the solution of four MWSS problems in each connected component C of $\bar{G} - \bar{M}$. This can be done in $\mathcal{O}(|V(C)|\sqrt{(}|E(C)|))$ time if C is a {claw, net}-free graph with $\alpha(C) \geq 4$ ([8]) and in $\mathcal{O}(|E(C)| \log(|V(C)|))$ if $\alpha(C \setminus V(M)) \leq 3$ ([7]).

In conclusion, one can produce in time $\mathcal{O}(|V|^2 \log(|V|))$ a MWSS of a claw-free graph $G(V, E)$.

References

1. Faenza, Y., Oriolo, G., Stauffer, G.: Solving the weighted stable set problem in claw-free graphs via decomposition. J. ACM **61**(4), 20 (2014)
2. Fouquet, J.: A strengthening of Ben Rebea's lemma. J. Comb. Theory, Ser. B **59**(1), 35–40 (1993)
3. Lanlignel, J.M., Raynaud, O., Thierry, E.: Pruning graphs with digital search trees. application to distance hereditary graphs. In: STACS'00, pp. 529–541 (2000)
4. Lovász, L., Plummer, M.: Matching theory. Annals of Discrete Mathematics, 29. North-Holland Mathematics Studies, 121. Amsterdam etc.: North-Holland. XXXIII, 544 p. (1986)
5. Mannino, C., Sassano, A.: An exact algorithm for the maximum stable set problem. Computational Optimization and Applications **3(4)**, 234–258 (1994)
6. Minty, G.J.: On maximal independent sets of vertices in claw-free graphs. J. Comb. Theory, Ser. B **28**, 284–304 (1980)

7. Nobili, P., Sassano, A.: An $\mathcal{O}(m \log n)$ algorithm for the weighted stable set problem in claw-free graphs with $\alpha(G) \leq 3$. Submitted (2014)
8. Nobili, P., Sassano, A.: An $\mathcal{O}(n\sqrt{m})$ algorithm for the weighted stable set problem in {claw, net}-free graphs with $\alpha(G) \geq 4$. Submitted (2014)
9. Schrijver, A.: Combinatorial Optimization: Polyhedra and Efficiency. Springer-Verlag, Berlin Hiedelberg (2003)